VOLUME XXXIX No. 4

# The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
*Managing Editor*

ADVISORY EDITORS

MANOEL CARDOZO THOMAS T. McAVOY CHARLES H. METZGER
WILLIAM L. DAVIS ROBERT F. McNAMARA JOSEPH N. MOODY

## Table of Contents

JANUARY, 1954

ARTICLES

An Abandoned Approach to Philippine History: John R. M. Taylor and the Philippine Insurrection Records *John T. Farrell* 385

Richard II and the Church . . *Joseph H. Dahmus* 408

BOOK REVIEWS . . . . . 434

NOTES AND COMMENTS . . . . . 478

BRIEF NOTICES . . . . . 486

PERIODICAL LITERATURE . . . . . 496

BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . . 506

GENERAL INDEX . . . . . i

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Etudes d'histoire chrétienne. Le christianisme secret du "carré magique." Les fouilles de Saint-Pierre et la tradition.* (Jerome Carcopino). Francis X. Murphy ..... 434

*The White Monks.* (Louis J. Lekai, S. O. Cist). George W. Hinger.... 435

*Teresa of Avila.* (Marcelle Auclair, preface by André Maurois, translated by Kathleen Pond). Anna T. Sheedy..... 436

*Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, 1854-1928. Tagebücher-Briefe-Erinnerungen.* (Wilhelm Wühr). Friedrich Engel-Janosi ..... 438

*History of the Diocese of Cleveland. Origin and Growth (1847-1952).* (Michael J. Hynes). Edward R. Vollmer ..... 440

*Conspiracy in Paris. The Strange Career of Joseph Picot de Limoelan, Aristocrat, Soldier, and Priest, and the Gunpowder Plot against Napoleon on 3 Nivose, Year IX (December 24, 1800).* (David Darrah). Richard C. Madden ..... 441

*A History of Science. Ancient Science through the Golden Age of Greece.* (George Sarton). Martin R. P. McGuire ..... 442

*Troy: the Sixth Settlement.* (Carl W. Blegen, John L. Caskey, Marion Rawson). Martin R. P. McGuire ..... 444

*The Mind of the Middle Ages: A.D. 200-1500. An Historical Survey.* (Frederick B. Artz). Henry A. Callahan ..... 445

*Archbishop Pecham.* (Decima L. Douie). James A. Corbett ..... 447

*The Earlier Tudors, 1485-1558.* (J. D. Mackie). Henry S. Lucas ..... 448

*History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517-1550.* (Henry de Vocht). Michael J. Hynes ..... 450

*James Stewart, Earl of Moray: A Political Study of the Reformation in Scotland.* (Maurice Lee, Jr.). David McRoberts ..... 452

*Science and Religion in Elizabethan England.* (Paul H. Kocher). J. F. Scott ..... 454

*Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581.* (J. E. Neale). Carl B. Cone 456

*Galileo Galilei: Dialogue on the Great World Systems in the Salusbury Translation.* (Revised, annotated, and with an introductory by Giorgio de Santillana). Ignatius Brady ..... 457

*The Triumph of Science and Reason, 1600-1685.* (Frederick L. Nussbaum). Victor Gellhaus ..... 459

*A History of Ireland under the Union, 1801 to 1922: with an Epilogue Carrying the Story down to the Acceptance in 1927 by de Valéra of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921.* (P. S. O'Hegarty). James A. Reynolds ..... 460

*Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality.* (Karl W. Deutsch). Carlton J. H. Hayes ..... 462
*Soviet Imperialism: Its Origins and Tactics.* (Ed. by Waldemar Gurian). Roman Smal-Stocki ..... 464
*America Rebels: Narratives of the Patriots.* (Ed. by Richard M. Dorson). Charles H. Metzger ..... 465
*The Complete Madison. His Basic Writings.* (Ed. by Saul K. Padover). George N. Kramer ..... 467
*Historic Philadelphia from the Founding until the Early Nineteenth Century.* (Ed. by Luther P. Eisenhart). Cletus J. Benjamin ..... 468
*Rendezvous with Destiny. A History of Modern American Reform.* (Eric F. Goldman). Henry J. Browne ..... 469
*William L. Wilson and Tariff Reform: A Biography.* (Festus P. Summers). Harry J. Sievers ..... 471
*This Was Publishing.* (Donald Sheehan). Aloysius Croft ..... 473
*The Economic Thought of Monsignor John A. Ryan.* (Patrick W. Gearty). P. Raymond Nielson ..... 474
*The China Tangle. The American Effort in China from Pearl Harbor to the Marshall Mission.* (Herbert Feis). Kenneth Scott Latourette ... 476

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XXXIX JANUARY, 1954 No. 4

# AN ABANDONED APPROACH TO PHILIPPINE HISTORY: JOHN R. M. TAYLOR AND THE PHILIPPINE INSURRECTION RECORDS

By

John T. Farrell*

It is now more than half a century since the United States first acquired the Philippine Islands from Spain, and it was fifty-three years ago last November that the American people were believed to have endorsed, by an election of President McKinley, a program of territorial expansion. But to reflect upon the manner in which the history of this interval, the first half of the twentieth century, will be written, is to invite a query as to its beginnings: why have we never had published a complete account of the background and actual occupation of the Philippine Islands by the United States? The absence of such a comprehensive history as might provide a sound basis for an understanding of the impact of our policies upon those Filipinos who became subject to American military rule in 1899 and who, after

* The writer, who is professor of American history in the Catholic University of America, wishes to thank Major General William E. Bergin, Adjutant General U.S.A., for permission to study the Philippine Insurrection Records in the National Archives. To trace the history of that body of source material, as well as to learn what happend to the narrative history written by Captain J. R. M. Taylor, which was based upon the aforesaid records, the files of the now defunct Bureau of Insular Affairs were used. However, all ideas and suggestions embodied in this paper are those of the writer, and it is not to be understood that any of the same reflect in any way the views of any government official. The substance of this paper constituted the presidential address of the American Catholic Historical Association at Chicago on December 30, 1953.

July, 1902, became a dependent people under an American civil government, shows up particularly in the otherwise excellent studies of administration by Forbes and Hayden.[1] An imagined history of America for the twentieth century must of necessity include a great deal of subject matter relative to military interventions and occupations in many parts of the globe, Latin America, Europe, the Near East, and the Far East; and besides detailed narratives of world wars and methods of dealing with highly developed nations, there will surely be extensive, and perhaps highly controversial, evaluations of the American reaction to that continuing phenomenon of our own times, namely, the varied manifestations of rebellion against western control by the peoples of the Orient. The Philippines, China, other parts of Asia, and Indonesia, have all, at one time or another in the past fifty-three years, revealed specific aspects of this general problem. An introduction to a study of American policies, the search for a pattern, and, perhaps, even a reordering of ideas with respect to what in 1900 was frankly called imperialism, should create a demand for full details of the struggle to bring order into the tangled affairs of the inhabitants of the Philippine archipelago. It would seem, therefore, to be a remarkable thing that the essential materials for such an introductory work, an archive of basic source materials, and besides that an impressive narrative history and compilation of documents based upon that archive, have actually existed for almost fifty years without ever becoming available for general scholarly purposes. What follows is in the nature of a report on these materials.

Specifically, the burden of this report is an almost lost history, and also a sizable, interesting, but little known set of archives, both of which should have been recognized as extremely useful to scholars

[1] W. Cameron Forbes, *The Philippine Islands*, 2 Vols. (Boston, 1928), and Joseph Ralston Hayden, *The Philippines, A Study in National Development* (New York, 1942). The study by James A. LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*, 2 Vols. (Boston, 1914), reflects the author's wide knowledge of secondary materials and his experience as a civil servant in the Islands. He is the only one who has ever done even partial justice to the bibliographical items which he himself listed in the fifty-second volume of E. H. Blair and James A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, 55 Vols. (Cleveland, 1903-1909), or to those mentioned in T. H. Pardo de Tavera, *Biblioteca Filipina* (Washington, 1903). In a learned, but very partisan, account LeRoy has told the story of the American occupation of the Islands to the year 1900. He had no opportunity to examine the basic source materials in the Philippine Insurgent Records which are discussed in this article.

long ago, and, perhaps, both may yet find a proper place in the world of scholarship. The history has for its full title, *The Philippine Insurrection Against the United States. A Compilation of Documents with Notes and Introductions,* and its author was Captain John Rogers Meigs Taylor, 14th Infantry U.S.A. By way of further identification, and in a sort of Alice-in-Wonderland manner of speaking, one may say that this work was not published in five volumes, and that it did not issue from the Government Printing Office in Washington, in 1906, at the direction of the War Department—although many people waited expectantly for it in that year, and for some time thereafter. The whole business, an anticipated five volumes was, in fact, suppressed, but—as we shall see—after the type had been set, and only after some galleys had been distributed. Conveniently for the present-day research worker there is a very well preserved set of these galleys at the National Archives in the Records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. But it is necessary to secure special permission from the Adjutant General of the Army to view the archives from which Captain Taylor selected his documents for compilation, and which contain the original manuscripts upon which he based his narrative history. These are also in the National Archives, and while they are in a good state of preservation—considering their age—they are not easy to use for systematic research. These materials constitute the bulk of the "state papers" of the abortive Philippine Republic. Against that republic the armed forces of the United States waged war from 1899 until 1902, a war which is better remembered for the libels which have since been circulated about the United States Army than it is remembered for any factual history of the army's opponents. That is to some extent the fault of Captain Taylor. If his work, which was completed in 1906, had provided no more than is indicated by the title just given—suggesting only a history of campaigns in the Philippine Insurrection—it is quite possible that no difficulties would have arisen over its publication, and it might then have become known as just another history of military operations. However, the author's misfortune in not having his labors crowned by publication came about, in part at least, from the circumstance that he produced a study which, more than any military history might have done, reflected truly the nature of the materials in the archives. He discovered in himself a latent talent for writing history, and what he produced could much better have supported another title, to wit, *A History of the Philippine Revolution against Spain and the United States.*

Before advancing any further in our account of Captain Taylor and his work, it might be well to remark that there has never been any great awareness of the importance of the Philippine Revolution on the part of Americans who have written about the Islands.[2] Perhaps it should be said rather that if an acceptance of the reality of such a revolution has often been implied, its significance has been obscured by the practice of American writers—most of them political scientists, and some of them former government officials—in prefacing their summary accounts of the American occupation with a few generalizations regarding the inevitable decay of the Spanish rule which preceded it. As a matter of fact, there are some reasons to believe that the Spanish rule was a more effective one than our own became, at least for a decade after Admiral Dewey shattered the peace of a Sunday morning with his salvos. At any rate, the assumption of most Americans, regardless of the extent of their information, seems to be that Spanish misrule was almost if not entirely responsible for an independence movement which, wisely or not, the Filipinos continued against the United States. Americans draw too much upon their own national experience when they see every revolution or civil war as an independence movement. Actually, and a close study of events in the Philippine Islands in the 1890's supports this view, what really happened was that an Asiatic people began against Spain, and after an interval resumed against the armed forces of the United States, a revolt which, at least in some respects, resembles other national and racial uprisings against the West which have occurred since that time and in other parts of the Far East. It is always a disadvantage in reporting these events that they are more easily appreciated as independence movements; western sympathizers have always been readily enlisted for that reason; and in their origins these revolts may indeed, may invariably, have had something to do with misrule or a failure to rule properly. But when these rebellions culminate in violent revolution, certain evidences of what are more like conflicts of culture, or race wars, have become more or less standard: the self-appointed leaders speak for Asiatics, but they echo an ideology borrowed from Europe. This serves to get them an audience and a body of sympathizers abroad, while at home they use the same propaganda

[2] Of the writers mentioned in the preceding note, only LeRoy has attempted to show in detail what happened to Spain's control of the Philippines in the late nineteenth century.

to exploit racial and religious antagonism. The attempt to grab power may involve prolonged warfare, featured by numerous atrocities, and not only against one or more European governments; there may be also internecine conflicts, and repeatedly there has been warfare carried on against large segments of the population who are either loyal to the West or have responded poorly to propaganda for lack of comprehension. Whenever have these things occurred that they did not sooner or later threaten the existence of Christian missionary activity?

To read the narrative which Captain Taylor composed between 1902 and 1906 is an experience which illumines to some degree the whole of more recent Far Eastern history. While there is no room here for a full review of his story of the entire Filipino revolt, there is, however, a point worth making which may serve to suggest our insufficient understanding of the forces which have shaped the history of that people. Just as no one would pretend to account for the troubles of modern France without demonstrating a knowledge of the effect upon that country of the French Revolution, so it is equally important to attempt no broad estimates of modern Filipino problems without acquiring an understanding of a comparable crisis which affected the Islanders, beginning in the late nineteenth century. For published documentation, the fifty-second volume of the Blair and Robertson collection, the volume for the years 1842-1898, affords only a few items of importance, but it does have an excellent bibliography of printed sources of a secondary character. Blair and Robertson provide an effect comparable to an imagined collection of documents for the national history of France which would thin out to end about 1789. And to imagine further, suppose, however fantastic the idea, that the Duke of Wellington had wished to impound the French national archives after the defeat of Napoleon, and that he had succeeded in shipping off to England most of those which pertained to the period of the French Revolution, which were then impounded and thereafter concealed from scholars for reasons of high politics. Something like that did happen, as far as Philippine history is concerned, when, in 1902, the captured Philippine Insurrection Records were shipped to the United States, so that of all the varied progeny of the French Revolution, this uprising of the Filipino people, which has one line of ancestry running back to the Jacobins via Spanish Liberalism—the other line is an Oriental one—may be said to be the least well known, but it is, nevertheless, worth knowing better. It is not the fault of Captain Taylor that we have no readily available

documentation. The materials in the Insurrection Records are such that they make available a rich source for the study of racial, religious, ideological, and personal factors involved in the movement. His compilation of documents would have afforded, if they had been published, a proper sequel to those in the Blair and Robertson collection. The narrative history, which he composed to accompany the exhibits, may not afford the last word on the subject, but it is, nevertheless, very useful; and Taylor must certainly be given credit for his grasp of the importance of matters about which others have failed to show a proper concern.

For career officers, the Spanish-American War is said to have furnished a welcome relief from the burdens and boredom of existence at various army posts. For John Rogers Meigs Taylor[3] it meant an introduction to the Philippines, where he was assigned to the task of collecting military intelligence. It led to a further acquaintance with the Far East when he went with the American troops from the Philippines in the international expedition which raised the siege of the foreign legations in Peking at the time of the Boxer Rebellion. By 1901 it was decided by his superiors that Taylor should return to Washington, where it was understood that he might be useful as a sort of legislative agent for the War Department; he afterwards said it was to enable him to explain the Army's point of view to United States Senators. This was at a time when criticisms of the process called, "civilizing the Filipinos with a Krag," had burgeoned to such a degree that it was necessary for the Army to present a defense of its record. Since Major General Elwell S. Otis had selected Taylor,

[3] From the Taylor File in the records of the Adjutant General's Office (hereafter AGO), in the National Archives, one learns that he was appointed to the West Point Military Academy in 1885, that when he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Army in 1889 he stated that he was born on January 13, 1865, and that he accepted a commission as captain on October 10, 1899. He received commendation for his services in the Philippines, and he was mentioned in dispatches for gallantry before Peking in the Boxer Rebellion by the British General, Sir Alfred Gaselee. (AGO Records, Lord Pauncefote, British Ambassador, to John Hay, November 12, Washington.) His superior, Major William Quinton, described Taylor, January 3, 1900 (*ibid.*), as a "cool, careful man in battle, a fair minded man, administering strict and exact justice in garrison." The same citation remarked that he was "a linguist and picks up languages readily," and for this reason, and because of his excellent character, tact, and punctuality, recommended him for a possible vacancy in the Adjutant General or Inspector General Departments.

as early as 1899, to receive several boxes of captured documents, and there in Manila had ordered him to begin the work of translating selected items so as to inform the War Department, and ultimately the American people, about the character and purposes of the insurgents, there must have been no one else quite so well informed or in a better position to furnish information to Congress. However, it was not long before the quasi-lobbyist decided that he ought to consider the opinions of Americans generally, and to write "a history of the relations of the United States with the Philippines." His project received official approval, and after he had submitted a plan for the work the necessary materials in the form of all captured insurgent documents were ordered shipped from Manila to Washington. From the files of the Bureau of Insular Affairs we learn that an estimated three tons of these records arrived in this country, that these were received by the Adjutant General of the Army on October 24, 1902, and then were loaned to the Bureau of Insular Affairs. Captain Taylor was detailed for an indefinite stay with that bureau until he completed his project.[4]

The thirty-seven-year-old officer who began to work on his history and compilation of documents in 1902 was not a university trained scholar; however, he had some useful experience when, as an intelligence officer in the Philippines, he had begun to work with the records in order to assemble a card-index of persons. Now, in Washington, he began to sort the mass of materials, to put selected portions in order for translation, and to prepare for publication what he would call "Exhibits." On June 30, 1903, he was able to report to the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs that the documents selected for translation and further examination were in 2,034 folders, each folder containing from one to twelve documents, and altogether including about 12,204 items which had been read and noted. To assist him in preparing his work for publication, Taylor had a staff of five persons, including one special assistant and four others who were trans-

[4] For details, as recalled by J. R. M. Taylor in 1919, of the arrival of the Insurgent Records in Washington, and Taylor's prior knowledge of these when he was in Manila, and also for a memorandum of the Acting Adjutant General to the effect that the army was to retain control of the aforesaid records, cf. in National Archives (hereafter NA) File 2291 of the Records of the Bureau of Insular Affairs. Unless otherwise noted all correspondence used hereafter is from this file. In this instance, cf. J. R. M. Taylor to "Dear Hodges," Washington, August 22, 1919, and memorandum dated October 24, 1902.

lators and typists. Three of the translators were employed to work upon the greater part of the records which are in Spanish; the fourth one served because he was proficient in both Spanish and Tagalog.[5] As a preliminary sample, or so they thought, this group published in 1903 two pamphlets: *Report on the Organization for the Administration of the Government Instituted by Emilio Aguinaldo and His Followers in the Philippine Archipelago;* and the *Compilation of Philippine Insurgent Records,* I, *Telegraphic Correspondence of Emilio Aguinaldo, July 15, 1898, to February 28, 1899.*

Apparently everything was proceeding, at least at that time, to the satisfaction of William Howard Taft. That worthy, after launching the civil government of the Philippine Islands, had, in 1902, returned home to become Theodore Roosevelt's Secretary of War. He had served as head of the Second United States Commission to the Philippines, he had taken upon himself the responsibility for settling the gravest issues confronting the American government in the Islands, and he had been the first American governor. Now, as Secretary of War, his jurisdiction included the territorial government of the Philippines, and the War Department contained the Bureau of Insular Affairs. On December 19, 1904, he indicated a general approval of Taylor's work in progress when he asked the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee to do what was possible to ensure a special appropriation for the publication of records which would show the genesis of the Filipino independence movement. Thus, he understood what the general purpose of the project was; and he also understood that a full treatment was in order, for he explained to Chairman J. A. Hemenway that there would be material for four or five volumes, which would be "some time" in preparation. As a reasonable expenditure he suggested $15,000. Actually, however, no special appropriation had been made when Taylor reported that he was finished and ready to go to press, March 24, 1906. But there was general agreement that enough money was available in War Depart-

[5] Taylor's report of June 30, 1903, is in NA File 116, Bureau of Insular Affairs. His staff is described in another report, July 29, 1903, also to the chief of the bureau, but to be found only in Drawer 58 of the Philippine Insurrection Records (item numbered 1292). According to this last the quantitative estimate of all documentary sources from which he was making selections was, 129 manuscript volumes containing records of the Insurgent Government, 431 bundles of documents containing in all some 121,000 manuscripts, and 1,980 folders containing from one to twelve items each.

ment unexpended funds immediately to begin publication; and the Bureau of Insular Affairs was quite busy answering inquiries from correspondents who wished to be supplied with copies of the forthcoming work. There was a standard answer to most such letters, to the effect that finances permitted only publication of 1,000 sets, which would be enough for distribution to congressmen and senators, and other government officials, but that it would be impossible to supply every constituent who sought to receive them through his representative in Congress. The correspondence suggests that some press comment had been observed with reference to a history of the Philippine Insurrection by Captain J. R. M. Taylor.

The type was set and galley proof received in the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the summer of 1906; and the galleys of the narrative portion by Captain Taylor were mailed to William Howard Taft who was on vacation in Canada. On August 18, from Pointe-au-Pic, Taft wrote to Captain Frank McIntyre, who was substituting for the Chief of Bureau, Colonel Clarence Edwards, and said that he had read the galleys but that he would require some more time to give them the corrections which he thought were necessary. However, and just after making that statement, he declared that he doubted the wisdom of publishing, at least at public expense, a history "that gives so many opinions as Taylor's resume does." The *résumé* was of course Taylor's narrative history; there is no evidence that Taft ever bothered to read the bulk of the documents which Taylor compiled. The narrative is in two parts and covers the background and historical events which make up the history of the Philippine Revolution. As preserved in the galleys of the whole work—a clean and unexpurgated set is in the files of the Bureau of Insular Affairs—the narrative portion of the work amounts to about one-half of what would have been the first volume, and also the whole of what would have been the second volume. This rather unusual arrangement provides in effect two lengthy introductions which, respectively, serve to explain the historical relevance of documents compiled for the periods before 1898, and from 1898 to 1902. The first volume contains or, perhaps we should say, would have contained in published form, besides Taylor's introductory narrative, seventy-three translations of documents—or as the editor called them, exhibits. The second prospective volume, all narrative and for the period 1898-1902, is followed by galleys for three more volumes to contain 1,430 exhibits. Topically, the Taylor history and the compiled documents afford an

incomparable view of such events as, the origins of the 1896 uprising against Spain, in which Filipino Freemasonry figured very prominently, and the suppression of that revolt with the indispensable assistance of the missionary friars, the activities of the exiled and defeated revolutionaries in 1897 and 1898—particularly the activities of the Hong Kong Junta—the maneuverings of Aguinaldo and his sometime rivals and associates, some background on Admiral Dewey's relations with Aguinaldo, and then the whole story of the break which led to the Filipino insurrection against the United States. It is more a Philippine than an American history, but it is, nonetheless, fascinating for the student of American policies in the Far East. The galleys reveal to the reader a very creditable achievement for the man who, with his small staff of assistants, constituted at the time the whole of the army history project for the Philippine Insurrection. But Taft did not say that he was impressed by the magnitude or by the quality of the work as far as he had seen it. Quite in the opposite vein, he told Captain McIntyre that while Taylor might correct the proof of the documents he must leave the history "for our correction." He then added a postscript:

> I would try to do this myself now, but I have more work on than would permit me to do it with satisfaction. One of the things I do not wish to do is to have the matter published before Congress meets, or rather before the election, for I don't care to give it out as an election document.

And if Taft was not able to do the correcting of the history, it was not at all clear how Captain Taylor was to do any further work on the documents, for the latter was required, and at the direction of the Secretary of War, to rejoin his regiment.[6]

The postscript to Taft's letter of August 18 raises the question, just how a five-volume history of a Philippine revolution against Spain and against the United States would have, if it had appeared in print in 1906, affected the political climate of the United States. Unfornately, and after reading the galleys with considerable interest, this

[6] According to a note in the AGO, Taylor File, the Secretary of War had informed the Adjutant General that he was anxious to return Captain Taylor to his normal duties, but this was before he had read the galleys, for the note is dated July 24, 1906. Taft's letter of August 18, from Pointe-au-Pic, stressed to Captain McIntyre the inevitable delay in his finding time to correct the Taylor narrative, and said: "For this reason I think you would better send Taylor to his regiment."

writer can give no precise answer to the question; but it will be worth pondering for some time to come. First, it can be said that the Taylor narrative presents a rather shocking account of the Philippine Revolution and of the motives of the revolutionists. It may be speculated that Taft had in mind some indirect consequences for his Republican Party from the possible effect of the history upon Filipino politicians; or he might have been noble enough to refrain from publishing at that time material which, to the extent that it revealed their activities, showed a lack of wisdom and temperance on the part of anti-imperialist Democrats. He could also have anticipated a sharp reaction from certain American elements which retained an interest in various issues, in the settlement of which Taft had himself played a major role, and which had developed out of the American occupation of the Philippines. There had been a controversy with the army, in 1902, about the readiness of the Filipinos for a civil government; and there had been a considerable controversy over the rights of the Catholic Church. While the latter issue had been pretty well settled by 1906, there was evidence at hand that both Catholics and Protestants—although and, of course, each had different reasons—were not thoroughly satisfied with the settlement made. The resolution of issues in the Islands had all been predicated upon certain supposed facts—such as, for example, that in regard to Church affairs the Filipinos hated the friars—and if these became again matters for dispute they could easily arouse antagonisms and, perhaps, lead to no good results, at least from the point of view of responsible officials in the War Department.[7] Perhaps, just as important was the current situation in

[7] In February, 1906, President Roosevelt had complained to Cardinal Gibbons about the criticisms of American policy by Archbishop Jeremiah J. Harty of Manila. Cf. John Tracy Ellis, *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons* (Milwaukee, 1952), II, 124-125. Harty, along with other American clerics who had taken up the challenge to provide pastoral care for the Filipinos, had found the Church in the Islands almost destitute of priests. The condition is described in a report of the Apostolic Delegate to the Philippine Islands, Archbishop A. Ambrose Agius, O.S.B., April 19, 1906, to the American Society for the Propagation of the Faith. A copy of this report is in the archives of the University of Notre Dame. On the other hand, a letter of James A. LeRoy to the Bureau of Insular Affairs, from Durango, Mexico, June 19, 1906, deprecates the Harty criticisms of which he had heard, refers to the many Protestant criticisms of a too liberal compensation to the friars for their lost Philippine estates, and suggests that the bureau officials stop concerning themselves about the Catholics and start worrying about Protestant opinion. NA, Bureau of Insular Affairs, File 6352.

Far Eastern international relations, marked by disturbed Japanese-American relations after the Peace of Portsmouth. Japan's potential was a danger to continued American possession of the Philippines. No one understood better than the Secretary of War, who had in 1905 made a tour of the Far East and, in Tokyo, had signed on behalf of President Roosevelt an executive agreement which was designed to safeguard our position in the area, what a source of nervousness this was for President Roosevelt who, in 1907 and with reference to danger from Japan, had called the Philippines "our heel of Achilles."[8] Should the educated Filipinos, who made up the loyal and pro-American faction, have had reason to consider themselves insulted, and should the out-and-out independence party in the Islands have gained an issue out of the publication of a work from the insular bureau, which was anything but complimentary to the quondam insurgents' motives and conduct during the period of revolution, a serious crisis might have followed and one which would have seriously embarrassed the administration.

Therefore, and even if we cannot know exactly what Mr. Taft had in mind, it would appear that he had possible and quite legitimate grounds for refusing to sponsor, at least in 1906, a publication which might have aroused controversy at home and in the Far East. But Taft did Captain Taylor an injustice, never repaired, when he remarked that the latter's history was full of opinions. After all, Taft did not have the galleys of the documents; and it may be remarked here that if the narrative contained more opinions it might be easier to read. Forceful expression was not characteristic of Taylor's style.

Shortly after the disappointed author and editor left Washington, to rejoin his regiment, he wrote to Captain McIntyre that he had known from the beginning that he stood a chance of writing something the Secretary of War might not wish to publish. He professed to understand fully the reasons—but, unfortunately for us, he did not specify what he understood those reasons to be—why Taft had withheld his approval. Now, dismissed from his assignment at the Bureau of Insular Affairs, and relegated to a post which was about as far from Washington and the Insurrection Records as this country afforded—to the Vancouver Barracks on the West Coast—Taylor took his rebuff with dignity and an apparent respect for the national in-

[8] Cf. A. Whitney Griswold, *The Far Eastern Policy of the United States* (New York, 1938), pp. 35, 123.

terest. But it would be a long time before he gave up the idea of an eventual publication of what he had written.[9]

There was one man, however, who felt no obligation to avoid complaining: that was the public printer. The galleys which he had been expecting to have returned to him with corrections were not in his hands by the end of the year. He waited in all two and a half years before he finally sent a protest to the White House.[10] All that the printer understood was that it was simply a matter of Taft's procrastination; or at least that was all he could learn from the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, the now Brigadier General Clarence Edwards. However, the printer's invocation of President Roosevelt's assistance in order to move his type coincided with, or it may even have contributed to, a move within the War Department to get a renewed consideration of publication. Taft had been elected President in November, 1908, and it would be possible to publish the Taylor work before the inauguration of the new chief executive on March 4, 1909, and publish with his consent perhaps, but without attributing to him any responsibility. Technically, the former Secretary of War and former Governor of the Philippines was but a private citizen. It became the role of General Edwards to make a proposal to effect a final decision on the manuscript to Luke E. Wright, who had taken over as Secretary of War in the outgoing Roosevelt administration, and who was also a former Governor of the Philippines. However, General Edwards composed a letter which pointed out carefully the possible defects of Taylor's narrative, and while he did make the recommendation for publication he, nevertheless, cleared himself beforehand of any charge of uncritical admiration for what his brother officer had done. He concluded with a rather remarkable statement that, since Taft had never found time to correct what Taylor had written, the former Secretary of War and President-elect could not be said to have seen the work! Wright was content to inscribe only a

[9] Cf. Taylor to McIntyre, Vancouver Barracks, December 8, 1906. In the same letter Taylor declared that he had worked too hard on his history not to have a certain horror of anyone else improving or emasculating it. He offered to do any necessary revising himself, "in my evenings at this post."

[10] William Loeb, private secretary to President Roosevelt, to Luke E. Wright, White House, February 3, 1909, asked the Secretary of War to complete the work on the Taylor history or to withdraw it. The letter was written at the request of the public printer, Charles A. Stillings.

line at the bottom of Edwards' letter to say that he approved an immediate publication.[11]

But General Edwards had done more than invite Wright to consider the possible deficiencies of the history. About a fortnight earlier he had told his subordinate, Captain Frank McIntyre, to get in touch with Mr. James A. LeRoy, a former private secretary to Taft in the Philippines and a recognized authority on those Islands. In a letter which McIntyre wrote to LeRoy, it was stated that the bureau was anxious to publish the extensive material which Taylor had written, and that they hoped to print it in the interval before Taft's inauguration, quite plainly, as McIntyre put it, to avoid the possibility of the new President being held responsible for anything contained therein. He forwarded the narrative portion—and again he omitted the documents in placing the work in critical hands—and he asked that LeRoy provide them with criticisms in a hurry.[12] Now inasmuch as the LeRoy criticisms of the Taylor history were afterwards believed to have been decisive in thwarting publication in 1909, it is of importance that we know something of the reliability of this friend of the bureau, particularly in order to test his disinterestedness.

James A. LeRoy, who was born on December 9, 1875, had been a young man, just graduated from the University of Michigan, when he was invited to go along as a secretary to Dean C. Worcester of the second United States Commission to the Philippines, which was headed by Taft, in the year 1900.[13] Worcester had been a former professor of zoology at Michigan, and he knew LeRoy as a brilliant student who had completed a four-year course for the A.B. in three years. However, Worcester lost his secretary to Taft when the latter became aware of the young man's talents, and Taft used LeRoy in

[11] In justice to Edwards it should be said that he drew Wright's attention to two points of great importance: the value of Taylor's four-year effort could be assessed in terms of the material he provided for future use by historians, in the compiled documents and explanations of them; and a serious criticism of the narrative by historians could be anticipated without fear of wholesale condemnation of either the bureau or of Captain Taylor. He also mentioned the lack of precise footnoting in the Taylor introductions. Edwards to Wright, Washington, January 10, 1909.

[12] McIntyre to LeRoy, Washington, December 28, 1908. LeRoy wrote from Fort Bayard, New Mexico, January 7, 1909, to report that he had read the material forwarded to him.

[13] For complete biographical details cf. the sketch of his life by Harry Coleman in introductory matter to *The Americans in the Philippines*, I, xiii-xviii.

the most delicate negotiations with the influential Filipinos who cooperated in the establishment of civil government in the Islands. A very busy politician, LeRoy, nevertheless, found time to produce a book, *Philippine Life in Town and Country,* to write for the *Political Science Quarterly,* and to act as an unofficial press agent for the colonial administration. It was overwork in a tropical climate which contributed to a breakdown in his health, and he was sent home with tuberculosis after only three years. However, his friends were able to get for him a quiet post as the United States consul in Durango, Mexico, and all concerned, including his wife and three children, hoped that he might soon be restored to good health. He left Durango to accompany Taft on the latter's trip to the Far East in 1905, and joined the party at his own request. He justified his going on the basis of his numerous connections with the world of journalism, and cited his possible assistance value in reporting the events of the Secretary of War's travels. Always a zealous defender of the policies of the administration, and known as an authority on the Philippines, LeRoy engaged in a spirited controversy with H. Parker Willis over the latter's book, *Our Philippine Problem,* in the pages of the *Political Science Quarterly* for March, 1907.[14] Then, by virtue of a recurrence of his ailment, he was hospitalized in 1908 at the military post of Fort Bayard, New Mexico, and he was to stay there until he died, in February, 1909. Faithful to the last, he had offered to do campaign writing for Taft in the presidential contest of 1908.[15]

The last of LeRoy's considerable correspondence with the Bureau of Insular Affairs had to do with the Taylor narrative, but the files of that bureau do not contain his criticisms of that work.[16] General Edwards may not have known just how close LeRoy was to expiring—the obituary notice from the Pontiac (Michigan) *Gazette,* which is on file, mentions that he was not expected to die—but it was known in the bureau that LeRoy was trying to complete a book of his own

[14] Cf. LeRoy's review of H. Parker Willis, *Our Philippine Problem* (New York, 1905) in *Political Science Quarterly* XXI (June, 1906), 288-318, the reply by Willis and rejoinder by LeRoy in *ibid.* XXII (March, 1907), 105-128.

[15] LeRoy to Edwards, Fort Bayard, New Mexico, June 9, 1908. For details of preparation of Taft's trip to the Far East in 1905, cf. General Edwards' compilation of schedule and expense accounts in NA, Bureau of Insular Affairs, File 6352.

[16] NA, Files 6352 and 2291, have all the correspondence relating to LeRoy and these were searched for the LeRoy criticisms.

on the American occupation of the Philippines; for the bureau's services had been enlisted to secure all manner of official publications for the author's use in writing it. Considering LeRoy's serious illness, his preoccupation with earning a living, as well as his political distraction, his industry with respect to this projected comprehensive study—which in its incompleted form, nevertheless, made up two fat volumes when it was published posthumously in 1914—strikes one as an effort which compares with Francis Parkman's triumph over adversity, when the latter carried through his work on the French in North America while going blind. It is of some importance to note that LeRoy left to his widow and three children no more than a fine library on the Philippines and the manuscript for these two volumes. The library the widow was able to sell to the insular government in the Philippines, while the manuscript was disposed of to Houghton Mifflin Company. She rejected an offer from the Bureau of Insular Affairs to purchase her husband's fragment on the Americans in the Philippines. After her husband's death, Mrs. LeRoy was able to secure from President Taft an appointment to the post of clerk of the Land Office, and Taft was kind enough to furnish a laudatory foreword to *The Americans in the Philippines* when it appeared in 1914. However, when we examine this foreword there stands out a characteristically judicious estimate of the late Mr. James A. LeRoy:

> I think [wrote Taft] he was possibly not free from some prejudices, for those usually affect all men, but, on the whole, his intense love of the truth and his desire to be correct historically were so strong that his account and his view of what he learned from his investigations were likely to be as little colored as that of any historian.[17]

Therefore, it can be said that when General Edwards ordered Captain McIntyre to forward to LeRoy the Taylor narrative in galleys, it was with knowledge that the hospitalized victim of tuberculosis was, so to speak, a rival author; and it is to be presumed that an association of several years with this press agent for the administration had made Edwards aware of LeRoy's intense love of truth and strong desire to be correct historically. That two men, both of them in a sense officials of the United States government, LeRoy and Captain Taylor, should both have been engaged, and more or less simultaneously, in

[17] *The Americans in the Philippines*, I, ix-x. Taft also noted that there would be differences of opinion with respect to LeRoy's conclusions. *Ibid.*, I, xi.

producing books on the relations of the United States and the Philippines, is an interesting case of overlapping functions; but it is even more interesting that while Taylor had a full command of basic source materials, which were the property of the army, nevertheless, LeRoy had the enthusiastic co-operation of General Edwards—Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs within the War Department—in gathering as much secondary material as was available for what can only be described as a rival project.[18] To one who has had the opportunity to compare the Taylor history with the work of LeRoy which was published in 1914, it is obvious that the invalid in Fort Bayard Hospital must have been considerably shocked when he read, in December, 1908, something based upon original sources which was so much at variance with what he himself was writing, and which, in turn, was based mainly upon American and Spanish published literature, especially upon reports of government officials, plus his own first hand experience in working with Filipinos. The reader of *The Americans in the Philippines,* by James A. LeRoy, learns easily the truth of what Taft remarked in the foreword, that the author had a strong desire "to be correct historically," but he learns also that such a desire is not always and invariably a love of truth for its own sake. The comparison which we have made with Francis Parkman, where the author triumphs over physical adversity to continue with a serious work in history, can be extended also to subject matters and points of view. Like Parkman, who dealt with the French in North America, LeRoy never succeeded, and despite some effort made, in arriving at more than a compromise with everything Catholic. In Parkman's case it was French culture permeated by Catholicism, and in LeRoy's case it was Spanish culture even more strongly permeated by Catholicism. Both men were nineteenth-century rationalists of the New England Protestant strain, which was almost as pronounced in Michigan as it was in Massachusetts, and both men had achieved some

[18] NA, Bureau of Insular Affairs, File 6352, Edwards to LeRoy, Washington, July 10, 1908. The student of Philippine affairs for this period will note with interest that Edwards had to tell LeRoy that a great deal of material published in the Islands by the insular government never reached the United States in any form. This may now be completely lost, because the building which stored the files of printed material, and all contents, were burned in the 1945 conflagration which accompanied the liberation of Manila from Japanese control. I am indebted to Professor Gabriel Bernardo of the University of the Philippines (letter of October 15, 1953) for this information.

understanding of the Catholic Church without coming to admire it. LeRoy's prejudices are much more apparent, however, and these become almost antipathies where he treats of the friar problem in the Philippines. A typical partisan of civilization, he was persuaded to accord full honors to the Spanish missionaries who brought European civilization to eastern Asia; but LeRoy could not long be content to praise when it became obvious that the missionaries placed the cause of religion, when necessary, above all claims to advance in civilization. Taylor's history was not designed as an apologetic tract, but in its rather labored style it controverts, or, without the author's intending to controvert, as least contrasts noticeably with LeRoy's historical view of Spaniards, Filipinos, and Americans. In fact, when Taylor submitted his manuscript for publication, he included in his letter of transmittal this revealing statement: "It is possible that it may be considered that in this introduction I have done more than justice to the work of the Spanish missionaries in the Philippines. I am not a Catholic, and have said only what my investigations of the subject have led me to believe was the truth of the matter."[19] In sum, LeRoy was a masterful controversialist, with a swiftly moving style as well as a command of many facts, and the Bureau of Insular Affairs had every reason to be grateful to him for his frequent defenses of those who had made the decisions in the Philippine Islands after 1898; but he was by no means a disinterested critic of the pedestrian, careful, and—when compared with LeRoy's own publication—more objective history by Captain Taylor.[20]

On January 14, 1909, the public printer informed the War De-

[19] From the first and the second galley proof sheets of the set in the files of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

[20] LeRoy's and Willis' argument carried on in the *Political Science Quarterly (loc. cit.)* is instructive. LeRoy had called Willis a critic of American rule in the Philippines who had "a very strong bias," and accused him of writing *Our Philippine Problem* as "a political brief." In his reply, in March, 1907, Willis quite firmly returned the compliment, pointing out that LeRoy had never been anything but a civil servant who was quite dependent upon the good will of his superiors. Willis also noted LeRoy's unfortunate tendency to denounce all critics of American policies, and all who disagreed with him about aspects of Filipino life, as "incapable of telling the truth without distortion, either because of previous training and associations which unfit them for clear thinking, or because of some self-interested motive which keeps them from admitting what they know to be facts." *Political Science Quarterly* XXII (March, 1907), 106.

partment that there was already charged to their account $6,638.90, for the work done on Taylor's history, and that it would cost a further $2,056 to complete publication of 1,000 sets of the five-volume opus. He estimated a total of 2,250 pages for each set. Of course, no one, other than Taylor and the public printer, had as yet taken a personal interest in the project which could be described as completely favorable. It is reasonable to infer, however, that the War Department was conscious that a considerable sum of money had already been invested, and that before Taft's inauguration it might be possible to show some results which would justify that investment. But a week after hearing from the public printer as to the financial considerations, the Bureau of Insular Affairs received from Taft's private secretary, William W. Carpenter, the news that the President-elect had been sent a memorandum by James A. LeRoy which embodied the latter's criticisms of the Taylor narrative. According to Mr. Carpenter, these criticisms were such that Mr. Taft was persuaded that it would be all right not to have Taylor's work published, if General Edwards thought it was best not to publish.[21] The memorandum of LeRoy was not forwarded to the bureau; and it has not since been found in the Taft Papers in the Library of Congress. We only know about it from references made to it in explanation of the decision not to publish Taylor's work. The presumption is, of course, strong that it was a very unfavorable report, and that LeRoy found more than personal reasons for advising against publication. Still, it is a great pity that we do not have the memorandum, even though it is not altogether clear that this alone was responsible for what happened, or rather, what did not happen in 1909. It would appear that General Edwards, who was told that Taft would not mind, assumed responsibility for not publishing. Whether or not it was his primary intention to do so, the decision enabled him to do a last favor to a faithful civil servant who was about to die in straitened circumstances. One wonders, did William Howard Taft ever think of things like that?

[21] The brief letter, Carpenter to Edwards, January 21, 1909, is as follows:

Jack LeRoy sent me a copy of the letter he had written you and the memorandum with reference to Captain Taylor's book. I spoke to Mr. Taft about it, and he said he was quite willing not to have the matter published if you thought best. I don't know what you think about it, and Mr. Taft did not have time carefully to go into the memorandum and letter of LeRoy. It seems to me there is a good deal of force in what he says.

LeRoy died on February 26, 1909. As late as March 29 of that year General Edwards wrote to Senator Jacob H. Gallinger of New Hampshire that the Taylor "compilation" was in galleys "and after revision will be sent to the printer"; but that was poor advice, and it probably reflected a lingering indecision. Sometime in the course of the year the public printer was permitted to run off several more galleys, and then was able to distribute his precious type; so that put an end to his complaints. Just how many complete sets in galley were made available, and to whom exactly they were sent, are questions still unanswered. Besides the very well preserved set, which at this time anyone who desires to do so may see, in the files of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, there are others. The Library of Congress has them, but there they are locked up for all but government officials; one set went to the headquarters of the Philippine constabulary in the Islands; still another reached the archives of the government of the Philippines during the administration there of Governor Leonard Wood. The library at the National War College, Fort McNair in the District of Columbia, admits that they have a set; and so does the library at the University of Michigan.

The letters of Captain Taylor, subsequent to the decision not to publish his work in 1909, show some bitterness, but only with reference to James A. LeRoy. Avoiding any direct quotes, as the National Archives staff prefers, and to paraphrase the remarks of a blunt—though not often outspoken—army officer, it can be said that Captain Taylor challenged Mr. LeRoy's objectivity.[22] But in an otherwise very mild letter of August 22, 1919, he told a correspondent that, "Later Mr. Taft in a private conversation told me that he agreed with every word which I had said but that he did not consider it politically expedient to print the book."[23] It would be twenty-seven years after the disappointment of 1909 before Taylor would cease to believe that someday, somehow, he would succeed in getting his history printed. He was in touch with the War Department from time to time, and a filed memorandum for July 6, 1936, bears this rather pathetic notation: "Col. Taylor informed me privately today that he thought he would abandon the idea of seeking publication of the documents."

[22] Cf. Taylor to McIntyre, Fort William Harrison, Montana, May 8, 1910, and same to same, from Constantinople (where Taylor was military attaché during the Balkan Wars), April 28, 1914.

[23] Taylor to "Dear Hodges," Washington, August 22, 1919.

After retiring finally from the service in 1919 and with the rank of colonel, historian Taylor lived quietly in Washington, attending the meetings of the Military Institute and acting as the librarian of the Army-Navy Club. He died on March 31, 1949, in Walter Reed Hospital. Outwardly, he seems to have shown no evidences of what must have been a great disappointment.[24] Why should not the work of this patient, honest, and self-effacing gentleman and historian be rescued from near oblivion?

American historiography would have been considerably enriched if Taylor's history and his exhibits had been available long ago. It would be a great convenience for scholars today if the clean set of galleys in the National Archives were to be microfilmed and in that form distributed to all important libraries. As for the archives which are known as the Philippine Insurrection Records, these should be rescued from their present burial places in old-fashioned wooden file drawers, 104 such boxes which are piled in corners on that deck of the National Archives, which supports also—and by way of contrast—the beautifully arranged records of the army of the Confederate States of America. Despite the fact that a student who receives special permission to look at the Insurrection Records from the Adjutant General will receive every possible courtesy and helpful assistance from the Army Records Staff, and equally considerate treatment by the clerks of AGO on duty there, it soon becomes clear that little or no systematic research in those records is possible for as long as they remain in their present condition. But they have not deteriorated. They could be indexed and filed in better receptacles; and eventually they should all be calendared. At present, however, they remain "classified," i.e., in the category of secret records, and one may only hope that something will soon be done to remove restrictions which are fifty years old, and which in present circumstances are hardly justifiable.

[24] Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, expressed himself as in favor of publication of the Taylor work in 1919. Taylor had conceived the notion that the manuscript might be released to him for private publication, but the Bureau of Insular Affairs informed him that Baker refused to permit any such thing, because he was of the opinion that the government should at that time publish it and let the American people know the truth. Then the officials in the bureau persuaded Baker that a letter he had written to authorize publication should not be sent. Cf. *ibid.*, and memorandum in File 2291, dated November 3, 1919; also, Charles C. Walcutt to Taylor, Washington, January 9, 1920.

There has been no complete concealment since 1906 of either the contents or the character of the Taylor history and/or the accompanying documents. As we know, some galleys were distributed, and these have actually been used, principally by Dean C. Worcester, after his retirement from the post of Secretary of the Interior for the Philippine government in 1913, and for the purpose of enlarging the data for his book, *The Philippines Past and Present*.[25] Typewritten extracts from the Taylor narrative are among the items in the Dean C. Worcester Collection—which is also a highly restricted, but not inaccessible, source—in the library of the University of Michigan. Worcester had full access to those galleys which were sent to the headquarters of the Philippine constabulary, for he controlled that organization. On the other hand, it is interesting to learn that he had no permission, either from Taylor or from the Bureau of Insular Affairs, to use the material in preparing his book.[26] If the copious extracts used by Worcester, and which by no means do justice either to the scope or to the sense of Taylor's entire work, have not produced irreparable harm since they were used as pirated sources for *The Philippines Past and Present*, published in 1914, why then must there be any hesitation in making available the whole source of information?

There remain questions, whether even a moderate circulation of matter which could possibly reflect upon the characters of individuals who figured prominently in events of half a century ago—especially the Filipino insurgents of that period—could injure the national security of the United States, or the security of the Republic of the Philippines; and whether the material is of importance enough to historians to warrant the trouble and expense. As to the first question, it can be assumed that some people will be offended, as almost always some people are offended by the writing of modern history, but it might be not only useful but even reassuring for both Americans and Filipinos to learn that there has been a notable advance, morally speaking, in the qualities of Filipino leadership. Moreover, independence has been a fact since 1946, so that in itself is no longer an issue to be affected, and recall that it was the boast of American administrators before independence that the Islanders were learning the ways

[25] Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines Past and Present*, 2 Vols. (New York, 1914).

[26] Cf. McIntyre to Taylor, Washington, May 27, 1914.

of peaceful development in politics. It would seem, therefore, that there would be reason to hope that a broader acquaintance with the records of the Philippine revolutionary period would not have as a result any marked deterioration of the close friendship which now exists between Filipinos and Americans. Furthermore, the record of harmony and common action in the years since 1935, when the commonwealth government was inaugurated, and during World War II, and since independence and the participation of the Republic of the Philippines in the United Nations, not to mention the war in Korea, should demonstrate that common interests have been established which should be firm enough to withstand any shock from the use, or even from the possible misuse, of historical materials. Finally, and to recur to something mentioned earlier in this paper, the historical significance of the contents of the Taylor history and compilation of documents, and of the archives known as the Philippine Insurrection Records, can only be measured by the importance we attach to records of Far Eastern revolution. To anyone who has taught, or who has done research, in the diplomatic history of the modern world, with particular reference to international relations in the Far East, it would appear to be difficult to overestimate the importance of revolutions which have taken place, or which are now going on, within that whole area. It is a rare thing to find a body of source material on any one of these revolts so extensive and so useful as the collection which was used by Captain Taylor.

*The Catholic University of America*

# RICHARD II AND THE CHURCH

By
Joseph H. Dahmus*

The history of few countries is as replete with figures, events, and developments as that of England in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. The period began with the deaths of the warrior king, Edward III, and his famous son, the Black Prince, and ended with the deposition of the latter's son, the second Richard. England's most famous heretic, John Wyclyf, put in his appearance, together with the Lollard movement to which he gave his blessing. The dislocations and distress which attended the passing of the manorial system were graphically revealed in the Peasant Revolt of 1381. The long war with France took a turn for the worse and by aggravating the already bad financial situation contributed significantly to the growing pains of parliament. In the persons of Langland and Chaucer England could again boast a literature comparable to those of continental countries. These phases of late fourteenth-century English history as well as others, such as problems which arose in the religio-political sphere, have lent themselves to learned analysis. It is to the latter literature, that dealing with the relations between Church and State, that the present article presumes to make some addition.[1]

Two developments so fundamental as to be largely unaffected by changes in personnel in either Westminster or Rome exerted a commanding influence over the course of Church-State relations in England during the closing decades of the fourteenth century. The first was the Great Western Schism which broke in the summer of 1378. From that year there were two popes, each insistent that only he was the legitimate Vicar of Christ, supported by partisans eager to support their respective claims. Overnight friends became more friendly, enemies more confirmed in their hostility. Since France espoused the cause of Clement VII, England championed the claims of Urban VI, whose election had been the occasion of "joy and satisfaction."[2] While

* Mr. Dahmus is associate professor of history in Pennsylvania State University.

[1] The most extensive study is by Édouard Perroy entitled *L'Angleterre et le grand schisme d'occident* (Paris, 1933).

[2] Walter Ullmann, *The Origins of the Great Schism* (London, 1948), p. 103. Ullmann discusses "The English Reaction" to the schism in Chapter VII.

Rome and England might disagree over such matters as papal provisions and taxation, their wranglings must, perforce, be kept within the bonds of friendship. As long as France was at war with England and as long as France supported Clement, Pope Urban and the English could not but be friends.

A second consideration which exerted a dominating influence upon the relations between England and the Church was the Hundred Years' War. This long conflict between France and England raised two important issues, one partially neutralizing the other in their effects upon this relationship. On the one hand, as already suggested, the war pretty well guaranteed that England would continue to support Urban's cause. Actually England's loyalty never faltered. Urban was a valued ally and one does not repudiate friends during wartime. On the other hand, the existence of a more or less continuous state of war, with its resultant drain on the nation's ready resources, was bound eventually to raise to a dangerous degree the government's pressure on the Church to increase the size of her contribution. The Hundred Years' War was the last major conflict to be financed in all the worst traditions of feudalism—that is why it lasted so long. The nobility wanted the war but not the expense, and the temptation to pass more of the burden on to the Church grew steadily greater. The Church would have to expect, and to accept with as good grace as possible, the government's demands for more assistance. England was her ally in a far deadlier war than that which flared intermittently in France. She might protest, she could never defy. Actually the Papacy could thank its stars that it was the loyal Richard II who sat upon England's throne and not the unscrupulous Henry VIII, or the history of the English Protestant Revolt of the sixteenth century might well have been anticipated.

For Richard was the individual who could and, in large measure, did determine the particular turn the course of Church-State relations would take. Though there remains much in Richard's character and acts to puzzle students, about his attitude toward the Church there is little controversy. His devotion to his religious duties was above that of the usual mediaeval monarch. His opposition to Lollardy was unequivocal,[3] and he showed not the slighest sympathy for John

[3] *Annales Ricardi II et Henrici IV.* J. de Trokelowe, *Chronica et Annales*, ed. H. T. Riley, Roll Series (London, 1866), pp. 173-174, 184; *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis*, Vol. IX, ed. J. R. Lumby, Roll Series (London, 1886), 174-175.

Wyclyf.[4] His letters to the Pope breathe the sentiments of a faithful son of the Church. It is suggested that he led an army to Ireland in 1394 to further the cause of the Roman Pontiff against the Clementine Irish,[5] only to return abruptly to England without completing his mission because of the importunities of the English hierarchy that he come immediately to direct in person the checking of Lollardy.[6] Yet while the Papacy would discover no trace of anti-clericalism in Richard, it would find its own freedom of action on occasion severely circumscribed, on the one hand by the absolutist ambitions of the king, on the other by the anti-papal tendencies of parliament.

Such tendencies, which parliament had revealed almost from the beginning of its history, culminated in 1351 in the enactment of the most anti-papal measure ever placed in English law books in the Middle Ages, the statute of provisors. Though the professed purpose of this statute was to protect the right of English patrons to nominate and the freedom of chapters to elect, the decree, despite its ambitious intent, had occasioned but slight adjustment in the matter of provisions. Since parliamentary enactments during that period enjoyed the efficacy the monarch chose to accord them, the situation had remained essentially unaltered, and after, as prior to, the appearance of the statute, the "common history of appointments was that the king nominated and the Pope provided the same person, the chapter duly electing him."[7] Yet parliament had no other recourse than further legislation of the same kind and so continued to demand that the acts be confirmed and enforced. The Pope, on his part, was less mindful of the ineffectiveness of the statute than of its constant threat, so he kept insisting that the act be repealed. The consequence was an atmosphere of mutual suspicion that poisoned what might otherwise have been a thoroughly amicable relationship in view of the Great Schism which threw the two powers together. But more of provisors later.

[4] Cf. Joseph Dahmus, *The Prosecution of John Wyclyf* (New Haven, 1952), pp. 99, 110-112, 133.

[5] Perroy, *op. cit.*, p. 97. But cf. Anthony Steel, *Richard II* (Cambridge, 1941), pp. 205-206.

[6] *Annales Ricardi Secundi*, pp. 172, 183.

[7] B. L. Manning, "Wyclif," *Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge, 1932), VII, 451. Cf. also John Tracy Ellis, *Anti-Papal Legislation in Medieval England, 1066-1377* (Washington, 1930), pp. 103-120.

Of considerable significance in a study of Church and State relations under Richard II was the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Here at the close of the fourteenth century that prelate continued to enjoy a position of influence scarcely second to that of any of the country's officials under the crown. The chancellor might wield more actual power, but the duration of his term of office was anchored in the caprice of king and parliament. Above the vicissitudes of ordinary political strife, on the other hand, stood the primate and nothing short of a revolutionary upheaval such as that of 1397 was required to unseat him.[8] Unlike the French royal appointee to Paris or Reims, who owed his see to his established personal importance to the crown, in England the sequence and the emphasis were the reverse. The Archbishop of Canterbury was given a high office in the government, not in recognition of his own personal accomplishments or potentialities, but because of the eminence of the position he held in the Church. And even though parliament might attack with some success the practice of entrusting high office to members of the hierarchy,[9] it could not deprive the Archbishop of Canterbury of his first place among the ecclesiastical lords, nor of his control of convocation, nor of his position as primate of the English Church. It is proof of the eminently high quality of these men that they were able to preserve almost undiminished the rights and prerogatives of the Church as late as the last quarter of the fourteenth century in face of the ever widening activities of the government.

When Richard II ascended the throne in 1377 Simon Sudbury was the Archbishop of Canterbury. But the Peasant Revolt of 1381, which brought Richard out of his obscurity, closed the career of Sudbury who was murdered by the rebels on June 14, not as archbishop but as a chancellor, a post he had ironically relinquished just two days previous. So the first primate with whom Richard had actually to deal was William Courteney, Sudbury's successor. Courteney was the son of the Earl of Devon, through his mother a great-grandson of Edward I and thus a cousin of the king. He had taken an active part in politics since his translation to London in 1375, so his appointment to Canterbury following Sudbury's death was not unex-

[8] Archbishop Arundel was removed by Richard in 1397.

[9] The Bishops of Winchester and Exeter were forced out of the government in 1371. *Rotuli parliamentorum (1278-1503)* (London, 1767), ed. J. Strachey, II, 304.

pected. He accepted the great seal in August, 1381, only to surrender it the following November, possibly because of a petition presented in parliament which demanded a reform of the chancery. Commons proposed that the wisest and most discreet person be selected as chancellor, whether he be cleric or layman. They expressed the suspicion that that had not always been the principle observed in filling the post, for the majority of those holding that office had been, as it was said, "too fat in body and purse and too well-furred."[10]

But though Courteney held high political office but a few months, as archbishop he found politics almost as much a bedfellow as when chancellor. His first encounter with the king came early in 1385 over the question of a clerical subsidy. In the preceding fall parliament had voted the crown a half-tenth on condition that the king take the field personally in the campaign being planned against the French, and it had added a second half-tenth provided convocation would make grants of corresponding size.[11] A subsidy similarly conditioned on the co-operation of the clergy had been made by parliament in 1383 without evoking any strenuous objection from convocation. Now, however, Archbishop Courteney interposed a vigorous protest in order to prevent such conditional grants from becoming the rule, and he declared that the Church was free and could not be taxed by the laity; that he would rather lose his head in this cause than permit the English Church to be enslaved.[12]

Instead of silencing what the archbishop considered the arrogant presumptions of the commons, the protest provoked rather a severe attack on the Church. Charging that the Church's wealth had made it impudent and left it callous to its responsibilities to the poor, several of the knights proposed the immediate appropriation of its wealth, one squire being so sanguine as to bespeak a goodly portion for himself in the liquidation of St. Albans.[13] But since Courteney was adamant and refused to call convocation to consider the matter of a sub-

[10] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 101. William Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England* (Oxford, 1875), II, 461, suggests that Courteney was forced out because with the king he "wished so far to observe the agreement with the rustics as to introduce some amelioration into their condition."

[11] Register of William Courteney, fol. 78; David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae* (London, 1737), III, 179.

[12] Register of William Courteney, fol. 81-81v; Wilkins, III, 193.

[13] Thomas Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. T. Riley, Roll Series (London, 1864), II, 139-140.

sidy until the offensive provision had been withdrawn, the king was obliged to intervene. As a matter of fact, Richard II was hardly less averse to this threat to the Church's theoretically free position in voting subsidies than the archbishop himself. To have permitted parliament to secure even indirect control over the taxation of the clergy would have left the king to deal with an institution far less tractable than he had found the Roman Church.[14] He accordingly ordered the odious provision struck from the roll and publicly repudiated. He announced, furthermore, that not only would he maintain the Church in possession of all those privileges which it had enjoyed at his accession, but he would seek to enhance its position. Convocation responded with a grateful two half-tenths, for which contribution Richard declared himself infinitely more pleased than had the clergy voted him four times that amount under pressure.[15]

But King Richard's reassuring statement proved more dramatic than true. A month later, in January, 1385, he instructed Archbishop Courteney to summon convocation to meet before the fourth Sunday of Lent (March 12) to take up the matter of another subsidy.[16] Since convocation had voted the crown two half-tenths scarcely more than a month prior to this last request, and just two months before had paid the tenth which they had voted in May, 1384, which, as they explained to the king at the time, they had been unable to pay any earlier because of the "poverty of the clergy," the archbishop considered this request clearly unreasonable. He wrote as much to the king and he mentioned how the prelates "marvelled" that he had ordered convocation to sit again so soon. As it was, a papal request for financial assistance had already been tabled because of the royal importunities. Furthermore, since Richard was offering the clergy no inducement to vote an additional grant, and in view of the fact that parliament had not been summoned preparatory to securing help from that quarter, the king should be satisfied with what had already been voted, together with their prayers.[17] The archbishop appealed to the

[14] As long as convocation's grants were, at least in theory, unconnected with those voted by parliament, the king could hope to make direct demands upon the clergy. This he soon tried to do. Cf. below p. 414.

[15] Register of William Courteney, fol. 82; Wilkins, III, 193; Walsingham, II, 140; Higden, IX, 74. There is no record of this protest in the rolls.

[16] *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1381-1385*, p. 605; Register of William Courteney, fol. 82.

[17] Register of William Courteney, fol. 82v-83; Wilkins, III, 186-187.

chancellor, the treasurer, the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Exeter, and, in particular, to the king's confessor, to add their petitions to his, lest Richard in his pique lay his hand on the property of the Church. He concluded the letter to the king's confessor somewhat melodramatically with the words: "Yet since I alone may summon convocation, at least the clergy will not suffer should I fail to do so, but only myself, to which danger I gladly expose myself."[18]

But Richard would not be denied. He issued a second writ dated February 24 repeating his order that Courteney summon convocation. With this second order he specified both the time and place of meeting: convocation was to convene at London on the Monday before the feast of St. George (April 17).[19] That the king had presumed to appoint the date when convocation was to meet was unusual, since it was traditional to leave the choice of day on which convocation was to convene as well as the place to the discretion of the archbishop. Small comfort, to be sure, for the archbishop to have the privilege of determining within the limits of a month or so when convocation was to sit, but this breach of courtesy strongly suggested that Richard would not be content any longer with anything short of direct control of convocation. The most disturbing feature of the king's order was the fact that he had instructed convocation to meet even though parliament was not in session, neither had it been since the last meeting of the clergy.

But Richard II was moving too fast. An earlier instance of the king's setting the date for a meeting of convocation had occurred in the fall of 1383. On that occasion Archbishop Courteney had denounced the king's action as without precedent, and to give point to his protest had summoned convocation to meet not on the day appointed by the king, November 12, but rather on December 2.[20] Now since he felt that he dared not temporize any longer in view of Richard's second order, he issued instructions that the clergy assemble, not on April 17, however, as directed by the king but on May 4.[21] By way of proclaiming his resentment of the king's action, he point-

[18] Register of William Courteney, fol. 83; Wilkins, III, 187.

[19] *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1381-1385,* p. 397.

[20] *Register of Thomas de Brantyngham, Bishop of Exeter, 1370-1394,* ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolf (London, 1901), I, 502.

[21] For the king's writ, cf. *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1381-1385,* p. 609; for Courteney's mandate, *Wykeham's Register,* ed. T. F. Kirby [Hampshire Record Society Publications] (London, 1899), II, 365.

edly absented himself and commissioned the Bishops of London and Winchester to direct the proceedings in his place. When the clergy "for sufficient and reasonable cause" failed to vote the king a subsidy, the archbishop ordered convocation dissolved.[22] There were no royal reprisals. Richard either was not prepared to go beyond what he had already attempted, or he bethought himself of a less offensive method of raising the money he needed.

For the king was not to be entirely denied. Though convocation had refused to vote him a new subsidy, he demanded on June 12 that the archbishop arrange to turn over to him the second half-tenth the clergy had voted the crown the previous December which had been made contingent upon his leading personally the campaign against the French. When convocation had authorized this grant, it had stipulated that if this provision was met, namely, that the king lead the army in person, then the grant was to be collected not later than fifteen days after the feast of St. John the Baptist (June 24). In his letter of June 12 to Courteney the king explained that his council was now of the opinion that it would be advisable for him to accompany the army, and that, therefore, the archbishop was to have the amount certified on July 22 and file the names of the collectors of the levy with the exchequer within the octave of the feast of St. John the Baptist.

The king was on fairly secure ground here, although Courteney again raised the question of legality. In a letter to the Bishop of London dated June 24 he scored the irregular nature of the king's request. While convocation had, to be sure, made the grant the king was now demanding, it had provided at the time of the grant that the money be collected within fifteen days of the feast of St. John the Baptist. Since the king's directive had been issued too late to permit the subsidy to be collected before that date, the grant must be considered to have lapsed.

> It is not strange that we wonder that without a new grant being made by us, such a royal brief should be forthcoming, as though, which one would conclude from the king's letter . . . the terminal date might be moved back or extended to some future date at the whim of the person requesting the grant; such we firmly believe was not the intention of those making the grant.[23]

---

[22] Register of William Courteney, fol. 83; Wilkins, III, 187.

[23] Register of William Courteney, fol. 83-83v; Wilkins, III, 188.

Courteney instructed the Bishop of London to make speedy inquiry of all the suffragans to ascertain what had been their mind at the time the grant had been voted. Whether the bishops accepted the legitimacy of the king's claim or whether they considered the basis of the archbishop's case too technical to press, in any event the grant was paid in October.[24]

Archbishop Courteney and the other prelates found themselves caught up on several occasions in the long contest between Richard II and the aristocracy for control of the government.[25] The first victory in this fierce struggle for power was won by the greater lords who overreached themselves, however, in their hour of triumph through the vindictiveness they displayed in the "Merciless Parliament." For the ruthlessness of this parliament in demanding the heads of the king's advisors, the ecclesiastical lords bear only negative responsibility. Sensing the bitter temper of the lords who would be satisfied with nothing less than blood, Archbishop Courteney rose and addressed a formal protest in the name of the assembled prelates: that while they possessed equal right with the lay lords to advise, counsel, and consult with the crown, inasmuch as the present session was to deal with matters "in which, according to our holy canons, we are not permitted to concern ourselves in any way," they would retire from the chamber, but their withdrawal was not to be considered as establishing a precedent.[26]

The second victory was the king's, and the lords, the so-called appellants, who had directed the prosecution of Richard's friends in 1388, found themselves in 1397 at the bar of "justice." In the course of the ensuing trials the ecclesiastical lords were confronted with several delicate issues which the crown raised. The first question which the king asked was whether he could revoke charters of pardon which he had earlier extended to several of the men awaiting trial on

[24] *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1385-1389*, p. 21.

[25] The archbishop, on one occasion in the summer of 1384, almost suffered physical injury at the king's own hand. Richard had become so incensed at Courteney's bitter and repeated criticism of his choice of advisers and his management of the realm, that he drew his sword and was prevented from striking the prelate only by the prompt intervention of several lords who were in attendance. Cf. Walsingham, II, 128; Higden, IX, 58-59; Adam of Usk, *Chronicon*, ed. E. Maunde Thompson (London, 1904), p. 8.

[26] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 236-237; Register of William Courteney, fol. 174; Wilkins, III, 203-204.

the grounds that he had not been an entirely free agent when he granted them. All the prelates, with the exception of Thomas Arundel, now Archbishop of Canterbury, whose brother was among the lords facing execution, agreed that the king was within his royal prerogative in revoking such charters. The archbishop averred, on the other hand, that so sublime and lofty were the king's pardoning powers, that he dared not maintain that he could revoke a pardon which he had once granted. A second question the prelates found more difficulty in answering. This concerned the right of the king to revoke the particular pardon he had gratuitously extended to the Earl of Arundel in 1394 when he had been entirely free of any pressure. From fear, or because they had lost their senses, so the chronicler charges, the prelates declared that the king might likewise revoke that pardon. The chronicler finds their position all the more lamentable in contrast to that assumed by the justices, who, in answer to Richard's query, declared that any man who would take from the king his highest prerogative, which was to extend mercy to his erring subjects, was nothing better than a traitor himself. Had the prelates proved as courageous, so the chronicler declared, the earl would never have been executed.[27]

An issue of greater import for the future position of the English Church in political life arose over the question whether the prelates should take part in the trial of the appellants. Since again, as in 1388, the judgment would be one of blood, if the bishops wished to be consistent they would absent themselves as they had done at that time. When asked whether they would appoint a proxy who could cast a vote for execution should the occasion arise, they hesitated about what answer to give and kept putting off their decision until Richard lost patience. Several lords were similarly incensed at the delay and proposed that since the ecclesiastical lords considered participation in the trials as incompatible with the dignity of their position, they should be deprived of their temporalities. One suspects that the reluctance of the bishops to take an immediate stand on the issue was prompted by the hope that the longer the trial was delayed the less sanguinary might become the vindictiveness of the prosecution—or it was the result of an honest dilemma: should they be consistent and absent themselves, or should they take part in the proceedings in the hope of being able to moderate the final sentence.

[27] *Annales Ricardi Secundi*, pp. 211-213.

At length, in face of the angry impatience of the crown and a number of the lords, the prelates finally announced that they would absent themselves from the trials, with the understanding, however, that their action would not prejudice in any way the rights and privileges of the Church. But Richard balked at this qualifying clause, possibly lest it provide a loophole through which the action of this parliament might subsequently be attacked. With "curling nostrils and fierce visage" he demanded that the prelates appoint a proxy without further delay and without qualification of any kind. The ecclesiastical lords thereupon hastily appointed Sir Thomas Percy to serve as their general proxy, "to act for, consent to, and confirm, in the name of all the prelates, what parliament should determine," which blanket authorization scandalized the chronicler since the prelates were actually approving before hand that which they did not know might be determined.[28] Because this precedent, that of appointing a proxy, which was of dubious morality at best, was not followed on subsequent occasions when parliament considered judgments of blood, and since these occasions became increasingly frequent in the turbulent years ahead, the higher clergy found by the close of the Middle Ages that their right of peerage had gone by the board.[29]

The most serious controversy to vex the relations between Rome and England during the reign of Richard II revolved about the practice of papal provisions. It was, in fact, the system of papal provisions which constituted the greatest issue in ecclesiastical politics in the late Middle Ages. "From an historical point of view, papal provisions belong to the age of ecclesiastical centralization, and are one of the most obvious examples of the way in which that centralization worked."[30] Since the state was directing its own efforts during the same period toward the attainment of the same centralization, a contest became inevitable. Protests against papal provisions were heard as early as Robert Grosseteste, but the practice then was still in its infancy and Grosseteste's ire was aroused chiefly over the poor quality of the appointees, not against the principle as such.[31] But by the middle of the fourteenth century papal provisions had become the

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213. Only one bishop, whose name is not given, refused to accept the procuration.

[29] Cf. Steel, *op. cit.*, pp. 235-236.

[30] Geoffrey Barraclough, *Papal Provisions* (Oxford, 1935), p. 5.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 173.

normal means of attaining a benefice, and with its extension the protests which it elicited grew more widespread, and, in general, less unselfish than those which Grosseteste had raised. This bishop or chapter, for instance, might protest because some enterprising clerk had dared appeal directly to the Pope for a promotion which might never have come had he to take his turn after those who stood within the favored circle of friends and associates. Thus Oxford clerks often had no recourse other than through papal channels if they wished a career in the Church above that of a chantry priest or curate. But the majority of the protests against the system of papal provisions emanated from the landed interests who wanted to convert the Church and its property to their own use. Not the desire for reform but cupidity provoked the bulk of these protests and it is worth noting that it was not convocation but commons which was the activating force behind the enactment in 1351 of the original statute of provisors.

In the fall of 1388 parliament for the second time confirmed the provisions of the statute of provisors. It supplemented this enactment with a prohibition banning the further shipment of gold and silver out of the realm. The continued trek of clerks to Rome for benefices lay behind the first act,[32] Pope Urban VI's recent request for a subsidy behind the latter. Since the re-enactment of the statute introduced little change in the enforcement of the act or rather the lack thereof,[33] the Pope might have ignored it but for the supplementary provision which prohibited the export of funds. Even a milder man than Urban might have been incensed at the action of parliament in thus banning the shipment of money, for he had been given to understand that he could have a badly needed subsidy from the English clergy provided he first authorized a number of episcopal translations.[34] But Urban VI was anything but a mild man and when he found parliament thus closing the door to his subsidy after he had approved the recommended episcopal changes, he struck back with vigor. He directed the clergy to proceed with the collection of the subsidy and to have it ready by the end of October, 1389.[35] Next he issued a blanket order reserving all vacant benefices to the Holy See and announced

[32] Walsingham, II, 177.

[33] "But because the said parliamentary statute was never enforced, therefore all things remained unchanged as before," Higden, IX, 205. Walsingham tends to confirm this statement (II, 177).

[34] Higden, IX, 178-179.

[35] *Calendar of Papal Registers,* IV, 272-273.

finally the following episcopal appointments and translations, several of which were unpopular with the king: Gilbert of Hereford was moved to St. David's thereby nullifying the election of Richard's secretary, Richard Medford; John Trefnant, a papal auditor, was appointed to Hereford;[36] the king's nominee, Robert Wichened, to Rochester and the election of John Barnet by the chapter were disregarded in favor of William Bottlesham; Bottlesham's place at Llandaff was filled by Edmund Brounfield who had earlier spent some time in jail for supporting the Pope against the crown.[37]

Though Richard II felt himself helpless to interfere with the Pope's episcopal appointments and translations, he could do something about the collection of the subsidy, which he ordered halted immediately under pain of forfeiture. In view of Urban's record of vindictiveness it was fortunate for the sake of the relations between Rome and Westminster, which had dipped to their lowest point for generations, that the Pope passed away before news of the king's prohibition reached him. The episode provides one of the rare examples in English history of non-co-operation between king and Pope in the matter of provisions and demonstrates forcibly, on the one hand, how both suffered as a consequence and explains on the other why they ordinarily found little difficulty in reaching a mutually acceptable agreement. It is also interesting to note that while papal control of episcopal appointments was largely unassailable during this period, hardly less exclusive was the crown's authority in the sphere of ecclesiastical taxation.

As soon as Richard learned of Urban VI's death, he immediately took steps to heal the rift which was doing neither Papacy nor crown any good. Although his council had agreed, with his consent, to withhold recognition from Urban's successor, presumably to facilitate the termination of the schism, actually to hold a stronger position in bargaining for concessions, once Boniface IX's election was announced Richard sent his felicitations forthwith together with an urgent request for the promotion of his confessor, Alexander Bache, to St. Asaph.[38] And Boniface met Richard half way. In addition to rich

[36] Actually Richard had earlier asked Urban to make Trefnant a bishop. See *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Richard II*, ed. E. Perroy [Camden Third Series, Vol. XLVIII] (London, 1933), p. 64 (no. 97).

[37] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 59-60 (no. 90), 211; Higden, IX, 205, 211-212; Walsingham, II, 180; *Foedera*, ed. T. Rymer (London, 1709), VII, 617.

[38] *Diplomatic Correspondence*, pp. 73-74 (no. 110).

gifts which he sent with his emissary, he ordered the chapter's election of a successor to St. Asaph set aside to make room for the king's confessor.[39] It is a striking commentary on the consistency of even parliament on the issue of provisions that that body gave the disappointed candidate permission to go to Rome so that he could appeal to the Pope for another benefice.[40] As further token of his willingness to co-operate with the king, the new Pontiff translated the Bishop of Chichester, Thomas Rushock, whom the appellants had forced Richard to exile, to the Irish See of Kilmore and authorized the consecration of the king's secretary, Richard Medford, as the new incumbent.[41]

But the co-operation between monarch and Pope left parliament all the more hostile. Though the king might consider these exchanges with a friendly eye, parliament saw only the fact that the subsidy Urban had demanded was still being collected upon new instructions from Boniface,[42] and that clerical requests to the number of a hundred a month for permission to leave the country, almost surely for Rome, continued to pour into the court. Therefore, when that body convened in January, 1390, it was prepared to legislate more effectually on the issue of papal provisions, to close up the loopholes which had appeared in the previous legislation, and to provide means through which the statute could be satisfactorily enforced. With an intimation that part of the onus for the futility of earlier legislation against papal provisions lay at the crown's door, parliament proceeded to confirm and expand the provisions of the statute of 1351. It declared that any provision granted after January 29 of that year was void unless it were made in strict conformity with the terms of the statute; that anyone accepting a benefice irregularly would be banished for life, and if a member of the lower clergy he might be executed; that any abettors such as lay lords would be deprived of their possessions, while men of lower birth would be judged felons; that any government official, in addition to paying a fine of 1,000 marks, would be deprived of his office and barred for life from further association with the government; that any person who brought a papal summons, sentence, or excommunication into the country against anyone for assenting to or executing the statute would be deprived of his tem-

[39] Higden, IX, 235; *Foedera*, VII, 658.

[40] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 274.

[41] Higden, IX, 221-2. Cf. *Diplomatic Correspondence*, p. 78 (no. 118), for Richard's petition that Medford be taken care of.

[42] *Calendar of Papal Registers*, IV, 274.

poralities, be imprisoned, and incur the pain of life and member. All these provisions the crown willingly accepted but balked at the demand of commons that the papal collector be expelled within forty hours and that if and when he were replaced, that the man should be an Englishman.[43]

Against this decree both archbishops, Courteney and Arundel, issued formal protests in the name of the English hierarchy. They declared they would accept no statute, whether newly passed or re-enacted, which prejudiced the imprescriptible rights and privileges of the Church. "We will disagree with, cry out against, and repudiate these statutes, as we do now by these presents, and as we have always done repeatedly in times past; and we ask that this our disagreement, protest, disapproval, and denunciation be entered on the parliamentary roll by the clerk in assurance and testimony of the same."[44] One may assume that had the prelates considered the proposed legislation sufficiently serious in its consequences to have warranted it, they would have taken active steps to hamper its enactment or would have warned parliament of punitive measures with which the Pope might retaliate. It is entirely possible that they were in sympathy with part of the motivation behind the act, but they could scarcely have accepted the sweeping character of the restrictions parliament wished to place upon the Pope's appointive and disciplinary powers. Since parliament was originating the legislation, and not the king, and since the crown would control the execution of the statute, they had good reason to suspect that this new law would prove no more effective than its predecessor. In any event, since the approval of the prelates was not required, the parliamentary enactment was promulgated in May, after the king, in keeping with the request of the prelates, had ordered their protest read in parliament and entered upon the roll.[45]

Yet commons, too, must have realized that however often they might re-enact the statute of provisors their efforts would prove futile so long as the crown refused to co-operate. The Pope could be expected to continue to exercise what he considered his rightful power to provide as long as the king did not interfere, and the record

[43] *Rotuli parliamentorum,* III, 266-267; *Statutes of the Realm* (London, 1816), II, 73-74.

[44] *Rotuli parliamentorum,* III, 266-267; Register of William Courteney, fol. 332; Wilkins, III, 208.

[45] *Statutes of the Realm,* II, 69.

showed that if the king considered the Pope's practice an abuse, he exploited it to his own advantage. For as the prelates pointed out in their protest, while the statute might be aimed at protecting the chapter's freedom of elections, yet each time a contest arose over a benefice which the Pope had reserved, that the crown almost invariably seized the benefice and disposed of it itself. It may have been in appreciation of this fact and in despair of securing any co-operation from the king, that commons considered the feasibility of sending a mission of their own to Rome to plead their case.[46] While nothing came of the suggestion, the proposed step surely represented a realistic approach to the problem. Whether commons had any justification for expecting any more sympathy from Rome than they had received co-operation from the crown is doubtful. As long as the king retained executive and administrative powers in his own hands and as long as parliament could only ask, not bestow favors, the Pope would continue to do business with the king.

An embassy was actually sent to Rome, not by commons, however, but by the crown. What prompted it was the appeal of Boniface IX in January, 1390, to the English archbishops that they call their suffragans together, explain the critical financial condition of the Papacy, and persuade them to vote a new subsidy.[47] In answer to this request for money the great council met in May and drew up a protest to which the king affixed his seal. While the document opened with a violent attack on papal provisions—how benefices were being given to unscrupulous and ignorant men, and even to foreigners, how these men were permitting their churches to fall into ruin, how the English Church was being drained of its revenue, the clergy impoverished, and divine and charitable services jeopardized—it ended "somewhat tamely, almost apologetically, referring to the obligations of the King's coronation oath, and humbly begging the Holy Father himself to provide a speedy remedy for the evils complained of."[48] One would almost conclude that it was the wealth siphoned off by the Pope's foreign appointees, not royal "requests" for subsidies, which was impoverishing the English Church.

If the government expected a conciliatory gesture from the Pope in reply to this complaint which would have opened the way to an

[46] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 267; Higden, IX, 221.

[47] *Calendar of Papal Registers*, IV, 274.

[48] James Ramsay, *Genesis of Lancaster* (Oxford, 1885), II, 273. Cf. *Foedera*, VII, 672-675; *Diplomatic Correspondence*, p. 80 (no. 120).

amicable solution of the controversy, it was to be disappointed. In a sharply worded bull dated February, 1391, Boniface IX denounced the three statutes of provisors[49] as prejudicial to the rights and prerogatives of the Church and threatened with ecclesiastical censure any person who might obey or execute these laws. Two months later he sent Nicholas, Abbot of Nonantola, as special nuncio to Richard II with a courteous though firm request that the statutes be repealed. But Richard would not bend until he had received concessions from Rome, not complaints and demands. He ordered the collection of the subsidy halted which the clergy had voted the Pope contingent upon the crown's approval, and he directed that all English subjects who were in Rome in defiance of the statute return home by November 1 under pain of forfeiture and death.[50]

But between the papal emissary and Archbishop Courteney,[51] the situation which, on the surface at least, appeared headed for a complete breakdown was retrieved. The emissary warned Richard to be wary of French peace proposals and to make short shrift of any offer which did not promise a repudiation of the Avignon Pope and a pledge not to invade Italy. He asked the king to use his influence with the emperor on behalf of the claims of the Roman Pope, and at home to consent to the imposition of a subsidy upon the English clergy. Richard in answer expressed surprise at the vehemence of the Pontiff's reaction to the statutes since no other Pope had ever protested, inasmuch as these laws simply protected the rights of lay patrons as observed from times immemorial. He assured the papal nuncio that, while he lacked the necessary authority to revoke the statutes, he would be pleased to lay the matter before the next parliament. But he warned him that the Pope was expecting too much if he wanted him not only to prosecute the war with the French with more vigor, but at the same time to permit the collection of a subsidy. If peace came he might have no objection to the latter.[52]

True to his promise, the king did lay the Pope's case before parliament when it convened in November, 1391, and it was officially announced that among the reasons for the meeting was the "desir-

[49] That is the statute of Carlisle of 1307 and the statutes of 1351 and 1390.

[50] *Foedera*, VII, 698; Walsingham, II, 199-200.

[51] Archbishop Courteney put in a modest claim for part of the credit for the concessions granted the Pope in the subsequent negotiations. Cf. *Diplomatic Correspondence*, p. 230.

[52] *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90 (no. 133); Walsingham, II, 200-2; Higden, IX, 254-258.

ability of finding some compromise about provisors whereby the pope and the king might each have what pertained to him." But the opening address by the Archbishop of York on the text, "Render, therefore, to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's," made little impression on the group. Despite the efforts of John of Gaunt and of Richard himself who sought to persuade them to repeal the statutes, they would hear of nothing of the kind, although they did agree "lest they appear to have respect for neither pope nor king," to permit the crown to grant certain exemptions to the law. Those persons, for instance, might freely travel to Rome who wished to pay a vow or for other reasons of devotion. They further instructed the crown to continue negotiations for a concordat, which they would scrutinize and ratify if they found it acceptable.[53]

The papal nuncio and the royal council set to work immediately and within a short time succeeded in drawing up an agreement which did not violate the provisions of the statute of provisors.[54] But all their efforts went for naught when word was received in the early summer of 1392 that the Pope had granted a prebend in the Church of Wells to Cardinal Brancacio. Nothing Boniface IX could have done could have been more inopportune. Since this benefice had already been filled, and that by the king, the Pope's action had the effect of antagonizing the very person whose sympathetic co-operation he required if he expected a favorable solution to the controversy. When the cardinal brought suit against William Langbroke, the king's presentee, only to have the courts support the latter, rumors began to circulate about the stern character of the papal reprisals—how he would excommunicate not only Langbroke but those prelates and clerks as well who dared to carry out the orders of the court, and that he would even translate and remove out of England any recalcitrant bishop, thereby depriving the king of his councillors and ministers.[55] It was also learned that Boniface had rejected the terms of the agreement worked out by his nuncio and the council and had

[53] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 285; Walsingham, II, 203; Higden, IX, 262.

[54] The agreement would have left the Pope in control of one of every three benefices. Cf. James Baldwin, *The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1913), p. 496, and *Diplomatic Correspondence*, pp. 89-90 (no. 133).

[55] Perroy, *op. cit.*, p. 331. See *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 304, for a reference to these rumors, and *Diplomatic Correspondence*, pp. 108-109 (no. 158), for Richard's letter to Boniface in which he speaks of these "incredible reports."

ordered one of the members of the papal commission to resign from the curia for his part in the negotiations.[56]

Parliament's answer came early in 1393 with the promulgation of a new statute of praemunire. If the rumors were true regarding the measures the Pope contemplated against those who would execute the ruling of the court in the case Cardinal Brancacio vs. Langbroke, there was but one way to meet his threat, that was by blocking entrance into the country of any punitive order or bull so as to leave the victims of papal censure in ignorance of Rome's action. The lower house took the lead. It based its petition on two charges: first, that the Pope had recently excommunicated certain bishops who had respected and executed the decisions of the royal courts in suits about the patronage of benefices; second, that the Pope was contemplating the translation of several prelates to sees outside the country without consulting either the king or the bishops concerned, whose counsel was needed by the crown.[57] The temporal lords agreed to support the petition of the lower house since they found the Pope's actions to be derogatory of the royal power. When the ecclesiastical lords were called upon to declare themselves, Archbishop Courteney rose and in the name of all formally announced their position: that while the Pope possessed without question the canonical right to issue bulls of excommunication and translation, the petition before parliament could be justified on the grounds that Boniface IX was exercising this right in an unreasonable fashion and to the injury of the crown—"That he [Courteney] would not admit that our holy father, the pope, has no authority to excommunicate a bishop pursuant to the laws of holy church or that he cannot make translations of prelates according to the laws of holy church," but since such action in the manner alleged would be prejudicial to the king's authority, "he resolves to adhere loyally to the king and attempt, as he is bound by his allegiance, to support his highness in this and all other instances in which the rights of his crown are concerned." This judi-

[56] See Perroy, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

[57] "It is rather laughable to observe how soon the parliament began to fear that its own artifice might be turned to its prejudice. The plan of translating bishops out of the kingdom had been invented by the Duke of Gloucester's party to get rid of the archbishop of York. But it now became evident that if the pope could do this to punish a prelate who had offended the ruling party, he might do the same to punish a prelate from whom he himself had received offence." John Lingard, *The History of England* (Boston, 1883), III, 346-347, n. 4.

cious statement, upon the archbishop's request, was entered upon the roll.[58]

Whereupon there was drawn up what one scholar has extravagantly called "the most anti-papal Act of Parliament passed prior to the reign of Henry VIII."[59] The act read as follows:

> If anyone sues . . . in the court of Rome or elsewhere any such translations, processes, and sentences of excommunication, bulls, instruments, or anything else whatsoever which touches the king . . . against him, his crown and regality, or his realm, or receives, notifies, or executes them, he shall be put out of the king's protection, incur forfeiture of lands and goods, and be brought before the king and his council to make answer, or process shall be made against him by writ of *praemunire facias*.[60]

This statute has aroused a great deal of controversy and has received markedly conflicting interpretations, particularly with regard to the area covered by its provisions. Students in general have been inclined to attribute too extensive an application to the provisions of the act. Yet a careful study of the language of the statute will reveal several important limitations which sharply reduce the territory within which the act pertained. At first glance one must conclude that not all bulls were here denied entry into the country but only those which were punitive in character. One should note next that such bulls must of necessity be prejudicial to rights which the crown claimed. The right which was here involved was that of patronage which the English crown, in defiance of canon law, insisted lay within the jurisdiction of the king's courts. This right the Pope threatened to negate by warning his bishops not to institute and induct those persons who were presented by patrons whose prior claims to patronage he denied, and by excommunicating and translating those bishops who refused to heed his bidding. Professor Waugh, who has provided the most sober analysis of the statute, reduces still further the number of bulls to which the legislation would apply. Pointing to the preamble of the act which those students have overlooked who have exaggerated the significance of the statute, he finds there that the members of parliament were meaning with their legislation to block only bulls which the Pope might issue in the cases "aforesaid." The

[58] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 304.

[59] Ramsay, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

[60] *Statutes of the Realm*, II, 84-85. The quotation is from W. T. Waugh's "The Great Statute of Praemunire," *History*, VIII (January, 1924), 289.

preamble explains how Boniface IX had excommunicated certain English bishops for having executed mandates issued by the royal courts in suits over patronage. It states further that he was minded to translate, even to sees outside the kingdom, certain bishops who were members of the royal council. The Pope, in short, in order to force the government to compromise on the issue of provisors was threatening to "put out of gear an important part of the English machinery of justice," and by translating bishops "to throw the government of England into confusion."[61] It was to prevent him from doing this through his use (or abuse) of ecclesiastical censures that the third statute of praemunire was promulgated.

The crux of the difficulty in assessing the importance of this last statute of praemunire lies in its relationship to the statute of provisors recently promulgated (1390). Those scholars who attribute wide significance to the act argue that its enactment to supplement provisors became necessary when it was evident that the Pope could circumvent the latter statute by means of excommunication and translation. But in following this line of reasoning these men overlook two facts: first, that the statute of provisors had already provided for just such an eventuality by threatening with imprisonment, forfeiture, and physical punishment those persons who would bring or send into the realm summonses, sentences, or excommunications directed against any one for proposing, assenting to, or executing the statute; second, that after enacting the statute of praemunire parliament turned around and authorized the crown to grant exemptions to the statute of provisors, even to modify the statute itself, and to issue ordinances respecting it.[62] It appears to follow that these scholars would have to admit that not only was parliament being quite inconsistent, but that it also was enacting a statute which was largely superfluous.

It is more logical to consider the statute of praemunire as intended to apply to actual and specific instances of papal attempts to contra-

[61] *Loc. cit.*, p. 291.

[62] *Rotuli parliamentorum*, III, 301. Cf. W. T. Waugh, "The Great Statute of Praemunire," *English Historical Review*, XXXVII (April, 1922), 182. The king even considered sending an embassy to conclude an agreement, but was dissuaded by the council which stressed the dangers of the trip and the difficulty of enlisting the services of a nobleman. But Richard did write to Boniface assuring him of the peaceful intentions of the English government, with no mention being made of the new statute of praemunire. Cf. *Diplomatic Correspondence*, pp. 139-140 (no. 194).

vene the statute of provisors. Had an English bishop been guilty of defying this latter statute, he would normally have been prosecuted under its terms. But the Pope was not only beyond the reach of English law but at the same time the most influential man in western Europe. Should the crown have attempted to bring him to heel by punishing an English bishop for carrying out his instructions, the Pontiff might have retaliated by excommunicating the king and placing the country under an interdict. Consequently, where the Pope chose to involve himself directly in a dispute growing out of a court decision over rights of patronage, it would be dangerous to prosecute under the provisions of the statute of provisors those persons who co-operated with him. A more practical and, as it proved, entirely satisfactory method of thwarting papal efforts to nullify the statute was to warn Englishmen against being party to such maneuvers, as was done, and by placing an embargo on the entry of any papal instrument which might be issued in reprisal. To have issued a blanket prohibition against any and all forms of papal interference in the disposition of and disputes over benefices and offices would never have received the approval of the ecclesiastical lords and would, accordingly, have left a situation which the Pope could have successfully exploited.[63] The prelates were quite ready, as it was, to ratify the statute of praemunire as drawn up since its scope was carefully limited to actual transgressions by the Pope which they considered clearly prejudicial to the rights of the crown.

That the statute was meant to apply to the specific problem at hand and did not represent the sharp surge of anti-papal sentiment often supposed is borne out by the fact that no contemporary chronicler makes mention of the legislation and "for all that is heard of it during this period, the great statute of Præmunire might never have existed." "Indeed, the enacting part of the statute seems not to have been regarded very seriously even by its authors. It is badly drafted—in fact barely coherent, and full of words and phrases of doubtful import."[64] That its importance has been greatly distorted may be

[63] Waugh says the fact that the prelates accepted the statute indicates that its scope was very limited—"it would be well nigh incredible that they should have agreed to a measure which warned the pope off the whole of the ground disputed between church and state." *English Historical Review,* XXXVIII, 180.

[64] Waugh, *History,* VIII, 291-292. "The form of it is singular, and creates the impression that it was intended primarily to impress the pope with the unanimity of the English nation in opposition to the designs imputed to him.

attributed partly to the carelessness with which the statute, particularly its preamble, has been analyzed, chiefly to the use Henry VIII made of it almost a century and a half later. That it failed to take on any new significance in mediaeval times was because it was never applied, and it was never applied because the situation to which it was intended to apply never materialized. If Boniface IX had contemplated making the translations he was rumored to have in mind, he never went through with them, possibly because of the firm stand of the government, possibly because his intransigence might have led the crown to make peace with the schismatic French and to recognize his rival at Avignon.

That the statute of praemunire lacked general application is supported by the failure of the crown to take action under its provisions in 1398 when the Pope made a number of episcopal translations which aroused criticism in both episcopal and royal circles. Among other changes, he demoted Buckingham after more than thirty-five years at Lincoln to Coventry because of the bishop's "feebleness and age." Since the latter diocese would present the aged prelate with strange customs and problems, the chronicler considered the translation unreasonable. So did Buckingham, for he refused to go to Coventry and spent his last days at Canterbury.[65] Richard must have been disturbed by these translations, although Boniface took care to neutralize effective opposition from that direction by promoting the king's former confessor, upon Richard's request, from Llandaff to Litchfield.[66] But the king did have the clergy to meet at St. Paul's to discuss the recent hierarchical shifts. To his question whether they believed that the Pope had the right to make such translations and, if not, what he could do to prevent him, the clergy dared give no forthright reply. While several bishops admitted the Pope might be interested in the first fruits involved, the majority contented themselves with the observation that such practice was bad for the Church, since it impoverished the dioceses and left those clerks who may have been expecting to be promoted disappointed and depressed. Yet the best advice they had to offer Richard was for him to write to the Pope

---

Probably, in fact, it should be looked upon as a political manifesto rather than as part of a measure of legislation." Waugh, *English Historical Review*, XXXVII, 196.

[65] *Annales Ricardi Secundi*, pp 226-228; Walsingham, II, 228.

[66] *Annales Ricardi Secundi*, p. 227.

and ask him to "forbear from making such translations for the sake of the English Church." Richard is said to have been offended by their weak reply, for he swore that had the clergy elected to defy the Pope in this matter he would have lent them his support.[67]

The above episode clearly demonstrates the narrow character of the statute of praemunire which, according to common though erroneous interpretation, was presumably tailor-made for just such contingencies as this. Yet no one apparently even considered applying it. It also demonstrates how powerful an influence the Pope exerted in English affairs. This explains the essentially favorable terms he was able to secure in the concordat which was finally ratified in November, 1398, after so many years of negotiations and wrangling.[68] According to the agreement which in effect abrogated the statute of provisors, the Pope was to have one presentation in three to the major dignities in cathedral and collegiate churches, and one in two in the case of humbler benefices. Though the right of patrons to nominate and of chapters to elect was acknowledged in those instances where the Pope did not himself present, the power of the king to interpose his fiat was generally admitted. As a sop to those who objected to papal provisions on the score that foreigners were frequently appointed, the agreement provided that no foreigner except a cardinal could receive an English benefice, and no such benefice could be an elective dignity nor carry with it the cure of souls.[69] Thus the final disposition of benefices as set down in the concordat in 1398 was substantially that which had maintained during the previous half century: the lion's share continued to go to the king and what benefices were not disposed of by him were ordinarily distributed by the Pope. Yet the statute of provisors was far from being a dead letter "and from time to time it was enforced with much vigour."[70]

[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 227-228; Walsingham, II, 228.

[68] Boniface had sent an embassy to England in 1396 to seek repeal of the statutes of provisors, though, significantly, not of praemunire which by this time had probably been forgotten. The mission was unsuccessful, although relations between Pope and king were entirely amicable at that time. Cf. *Diplomatic Correspondence*, pp. 139-140 (no. 194); Perroy, *op. cit.*, p. 343; *Foedera*, VII, 813; *Calendar of Papal Registers*, IV, 295.

[69] Cf. Perroy, *op. cit.*, pp. 348-349.

[70] Waugh, *English Historical Review*, XXXVII, 186. Professor Waugh continues: "The effect of the statutes of provisors has never been properly investigated. But even a somewhat hasty examination of the calendar of papal registers shows that at various times, especially after the council of Constance, the

As Richard was deposed the year following the ratification of the concordat, his contribution to the history of Church-State relations ceased with that agreement. One might note in passing that he sent Archbishop Arundel into exile in 1397 but simply because of his associations with the appellants. Note also might be made of the articles of accusation which were brought against Richard in the course of the deposition proceedings. Though the articles were numerous and lengthy, just two were concerned with royal acts considered prejudicial to the Church. He was accused of having impoverished many monasteries by the great sums of money, horses, and equipment he extracted in preparation for his Irish campaign. The prosecution also charged him with violating rights guaranteed to the Church under Magna Charta when he prohibited judges in the ecclesiastical courts from passing judgment in certain matters which were purely ecclesiastical in character. The prosecution also elaborated at length upon his dishonorable treatment of Archbishop Arundel, no doubt in order to wean from the king those prelates who were inclined to support him.[71]

This survey of the relations between Rome and England during the reign of Richard II suggests a number of observations. In the first place, it is not a presumption to state that the force of anti-papal sentiment in England during those years has been grossly exaggerated. Even when preparing such statutes as those of provisors and praemunire in the early 1390's, parliament's mood was one of compromise, not bitterness. There was, however, clear evidence of an attempt on the part of the crown to use convocation directly as a means of relieving its financial problems. Had the ties between the temporal and ecclesiastical lords been less close, it is possible that Richard might have achieved the ascendancy over convocation he desired. Yet one must be careful not to dismiss the efforts Archbishop Courteney took to thwart the king in attaining this objective as entirely futile if not naive. Though Courteney waged a losing battle, he made Richard's victories so laborious that the king eventually wearied of the struggle and stopped far short of complete victory. On two

---

control of the pope over English preferment became very slight." *Loc. cit.*, p. 186 n. 1. See also Perroy, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

[71] *Annales Ricardi Secundi*, pp. 269-270, 272-273. Cf. also Walsingham, II, 230-231.

occasions during Richard's reign the ecclesiastical lords withdrew when the house considered judgments of blood, thereby opening the way for their eventual loss of peerage. Early in 1390 parliament re-enacted a statute of provisors with wider scope and heavier penalties than provided by the earlier acts, but what changes it effected were hardly apparent before the following century. King and Pope continued to divide English benefices between themselves with the bulk going to the king. The year 1393 witnessed the promulgation of a second statute of praemunire, but far from being the "Great Statute of Praemunire" as it has commonly been called, it was not even noticed by contemporary chroniclers, since it was never meant to cover more than a purely temporary situation. Finally, one cannot survey the course of Church-State relations in the late fourteenth century without being impressed with the decisive force the king exerted in directing that course.

*Pennsylvania State University*

# BOOK REVIEWS

## GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

*Études d'histoire chrétienne. Le christianisme secret du "carré magique." Les fouilles de Saint-Pierre et la tradition.* By Jerome Carcopino. (Paris: Editions Albin Michel. 1953. Pp. 286. 840 frs.)

These two essays demonstrate anew M. Carcopino's exhaustive knowledge of the intimate doings of the early Christians. The first deals with the palindrome *Sator arepo tenet opera rotas* in masterly fashion, taking Père Jerphanion's data regarding the provenience, dating, and probable meaning of the anagram, re-analyzing the evidence, and coming to the conclusion that the "magic square" is of Christian—probably Gallic—origin, and does resolve into the two words *Pater noster,* repeated in cruciform, and flanked by A and Ω. This had been the conclusion of most scholars dealing with the graffiti findings of the *Sator* at Cirencester in Britain and at Dura-Europos. But when, in 1937, it was likewise discovered in the ruins of Pompei, even Père Jerphanion despaired of unraveling its meaning or its origin. M. Carcopino, however, maintains that the exemplar at Pompei was the work of second or third-century Christian explorers of the ruins, thus bringing the palindrome within the same date range as at Cirencester and Dura-Europos. He is convinced that the scientific approach of Felix Grosser in solving the anagram is correct; and employs his detailed knowledge of the religious ideologies of the time to ramify this thesis.

The second essay takes the excellent but limited edition of the *Esplorazione sotto la confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano* (Città del Vaticano, 1951) as a basis, then proceeds to clarify the careful conclusions reached by the excavators. In particular, Carcopino wrestles with the problem of the translation of the remains of Peter *ad catacumbas,* and their subsequent return to the focal point of the Constantinian basilica. He believes the remains were first placed in a *memoria* or transportable box by Pope Anacletus in *ca.* A.D. 80; that under Marcus Aurelius this was deposited in the *trophaeum* on the Vatican appealed to by Gaius; that it was transported from there to the catacombs of St. Sebastian in 258 under pressure of the Valerian persecution. It is a well-articulated theory, in which M. Carcopino leaves no stone unturned to co-ordinate the data supplied by the graffiti of the catacombs, the *depositio martyrum,* the *Martyrologium Hieronymium,* the *Liber pontificalis,* and the inscription of Pope Damasus, as well as recent archeological data come to light beneath both St. Peter's and St. Sebastian's. At the least, it leaves no doubt

that Peter was martyred in Rome; at best, it puts us in much more certain contact with the probable history of the disposition of his remains.

FRANCIS X. MURPHY

*Fort Dix, New Jersey*

*The White Monks.* By Louis J. Lekai, S.O.Cist. (Okauchee, Wisconsin: Cistercian Fathers. 1953. Pp. vi, 328.)

Father Lekai has done a service to his order by depicting its history in a very readable manner while at the same time retaining his critical sense. His reference to sources is consistent throughout, and although some may regret the fact that he uses no footnotes, his excellent bibliography at the end of the book somewhat compensates for this lack. This bibliography furnishes the scholar ample field for further research, while the text itself presents to the average reader in an easy-going style an interesting narrative on the inner life of the Cistercians.

The book is divided into two main parts, of which the first treats of the history of the order and the second of its culture. To this is added a section of appendices containing the translation of two basic documents, the *Exordium parvum* and the *Charter of Charity*, six helpful statistical charts, the bibliographical notes, a detailed index, some maps, and thirty-two excellent plates. The maps and plates might have been more appropriately placed in the main text. His selection of material never leaves the reader in a tangled maze of details, but carries him along in an orderly fashion to follow the development and significance of the basic Cistercian institutions.

The contents themselves show the Cistercian Order to have been a development of the eleventh-century reform movement. It was at one and the same time a rebellion against contemporary Benedictine monasticism, a return to the exact letter and law of St. Benedict, and a development of Benedict's ideas amidst the contingencies of mediaeval society. Molesme was an anti-Cluny movement and its crystallization into a very definite form was from the start influenced by the strained Citeaux-Cluny relationship. Austere discipline, strict poverty, and a re-emphasis on work were the things that characterized Citeaux. These ideals prompted them to abandon the whole system of feudal administration of monastic property, to curtail greatly the *opus Dei*, to seek entire seclusion from the world, and to centralize authority in order to safeguard these ideals. The *Charter of Charity* provided much centralization in government, settling in swamp lands gave them plenty of work and at the same time seclusion, and the institution of the lay brotherhood made possible the attainment of their ideals to a fuller degree.

This new austere life took slowly at first, but after it was integrated into the personality of St. Bernard, it swept through Europe. This rapid expansion brought with it the increase of power, prestige, and activity in the public life of the Church, placing its ideals of simplicity and seclusion in imminent danger. Scholasticism left its mark upon the order, making it into an intellectual force through its many schools centered in its main house of studies at the College of St. Bernard in Paris.

The internal war of observances, the Black Death, the Hundred Years War, and the Great Schism were disintegrating factors which came just at a time when a quiet period of development was needed, and consequently shook the very foundations of the order. Its vitality was seriously threatened by the Renaissance mind, while the dissolution of monasteries occurring as a result of the Protestant Revolt almost blotted out the Cistercians in the countries affected. The most detrimental influence on Cistercian life was the system of abbeys *in commendam*. This replaced free election of abbots by nomination and religious ideals by political considerations, inflicting a deadly wound in a most vital area—the office of the abbot. Total extinction almost resulted in modern times when as a result of the Enlightenment, rationalism lifted its mighty arm out of the smoke and ruin of the French Revolution in an effort to annihilate the work of seven centuries. The spirit remained, however, and revived when men's minds again turned to God.

The author in the second part of the book reveals the cultural aspects of his order by analyzing some of its institutions in the light of its ideals, purposes, and accomplishments as they developed in their peculiar historical setting. Some of these institutions are the following: their schools, constitution, libraries, economic practices, artistic efforts, spirituality, lay brotherhood, and nuns. This volume leaves with the reader an accurate appreciation of Cistercian life in particular and of monastic life in general.

GEORGE W. HINGER

*Holy Cross Seminary*
*La Crosse*

*Teresa of Avila.* By Marcelle Auclair. Preface by André Maurois. Translated by Kathleen Pond. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1953. Pp. xv, 457. $4.95.)

Marcelle Auclair has produced a vivid, detailed biography of the Spanish Carmelite nun who became a leader of the Catholic reform movement in sixteenth-century Spain. The author narrates the story of Teresa's early years, her entrance into the convent of the Incarnation, a house of Carmelite nuns of mitigated observance (Part I. The World? or God?);

the establishment of the convent of St. Joseph of Avila, dedicated to the return to the primitive rule (II. The Royal Road); the foundations, their difficulties, and problems (III. God's Knight Errant); the attempts to destroy both the foundations and the reform movement (IV. The Gathering Storm); the last days on earth of Teresa (V. Beloved, it is Time...). In an epilogue there are recorded incidents regarding the incorruptible body of Teresa, her beatification and canonization, and certain events in the lives of several of her associates. A chronology in two parallel columns indicates the time relationship between events in the life of Teresa, 1515-1582, and significant developments throughout Europe. There is a serviceable index.

Madame Auclair has studied exhaustively the writings of the saint. In a foreword to the three-page bibliography she writes that no fact in the work is not in strict conformity with historical truth. For these "facts" the author relies upon Teresa's works and the writings and declarations of her contemporaries, using the former with discrimination, the latter with not always due regard to the canons of historical criticism. By means of frequent incorporation of Teresa's own words Madame Auclair paints a memorable picture of her extraordinarily varied activities as organizer, foundress, and mystic. She emphasizes always the womanliness of Teresa, the warmth of her personality. She dwells upon Teresa's spiritual development, her progress from mental prayer to the highest plane of contemplation. Madame Auclair portrays well the turbulence of the age, the evils against which Teresa struggled and against which she finally triumphed when her reformed Carmelites, the Discalced, who lived in strict observance of the rule, were formally erected into a separate province, their constitutions confirmed and printed.

This is one of the best and most readable lives of St. Teresa. It will appeal not only to admirers of the great saint, but to those who relish a well-written biography in which the subject, in this case a woman of genius, stands forth against the background of a colorful period of history. By special authorization of Pope Pius XII, Madame Auclair was granted the unusual privilege of visiting the Carmelite cloisters in Spain. Photographs taken by Yvonne Chevalier in the Carmelite cloisters and in the towns in which they are located are a valuable addition to the text. A map would also have been welcome.

The French original of this biography was published at Paris in 1950 under the title *La vie de sainte Thérèse d'Avila*. This work of art, as André Maurois describes it, comes to English readers through the admirable translation of Kathleen Pond.

ANNA T. SHEEDY

*College of New Rochelle*

*Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, 1854-1928. Tagebücher—Briefe—Erinnerungen.* Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Wühr. (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 949. 27 D.M.)

The papers of Ludwig von Pastor are an important historical source from four different aspects. They contribute to the history of the papacy from Pius IX to Pius XI; they inform about the history of the historian's adopted fatherland: imperial and republican Austria whose diplomatic representative at the Vatican Pastor was during the last nine years of his life; they contain valuable information on European historiography and, finally, they are the main source for the life of the historian of the popes.

The volume under review is composed mainly of the diaries and the correspondence of Pastor; only a selection has been published, and it was a small one if one bears in mind that, according to the editor, the copies of Pastor's diaries alone fill twenty-seven volumes in folio kept at the Vatican. The editor did his work along two lines: when the original entries were made in only a few words, he elaborated them into full sentences; on the other hand, he cut extensively. Unfortunately—and this is a serious deficiency in the present edition—such changes are never indicated to the reader. This omission reduces the value of the volume considerably and certainly should be remedied in a new edition.

The greatest importance of the Pastor Papers lies in the contribution they make to the history of the papacy during half a century. The historian enjoyed the confidence of Pius X in a rare degree, but his relations with Benedict XV and Pius XI went far beyond the limits set by the average diplomatic representative at the papal court. The entries on Leo XIII give evidence of that great pontiff's appreciation for the writing and the study of history. "Do it with love," he told Pastor, "lavorate con amore; vostra opera concerna i Papi, la Chiesa e la Religione" (p. 123); and another time we read the proud and justified exclamation: "Non abbiamo paura della pubblicità dei documenti" (p. 179). The information on Pius X offers evidence that if the pope did not enjoy politics—as certainly Leo XIII had done—he was far from having no interest in it. Also for Pius X's inclination toward the "integralists," with whom Pastor also sided, pertinent documentation is contained in the present volume.

It is, perhaps, worthwhile mentioning that on Pius XI two diplomat-historians have given us valuable information: Pastor and Charles-Roux, the French ambassador; it seems that their profession brought both of them closer to the *papa-bibliotecario,* of whom Pastor reported, that the pontiff considered his former activity an excellent preparation for the papacy, for as papal librarian he got used to being interrupted (p. 801).

Equally on two secretaries of state, Merry del Val and especially on Gasparri, the Pastor Papers have much to say, while a bitter incidental

remark of Pius X on Cardinal Rampolla as favoring modernism would still have to be checked by further historical investigation before being accepted definitively. Pastor did not live to see the Lateran compacts concluded; yet on their long history and pre-history, and also on the relations between the Church and Italian Fascism, the reader finds many entries of interest.

Concerning the contribution to the history of the Danubian Monarchy, the reader will bear in mind that Pastor belonged to the group of Archduke Francis Ferdinand which, while loyal to the ruling monarch, stood in opposition to his system based on the principle of dualism; they held that this compromise favored the Hungarians too much. The heir to the Habsburg throne, who for his sincere piety was held in high albeit not unqualified esteem by Pius X, used the services of Pastor for messages concerning the ecclesiastical policy of the monarchy. It should be added, however, that the historian at that time held no diplomatic post. Also of historical interest are the entries during World War I which render the conversations with the Austrian Chief of Staff Conrad von Hötzendorff. Little is to be found in the present volume on the policy during the first republic of Austria, and the reader is left musing on whether much has been cut out in this respect. The characterization of Archduke Francis Ferdinand (pp. 601 ff.) belongs, like that of Benedict V (pp. 726 ff.), to the remarkable pages which Pastor devoted to the depicting of historical personalities.

The sections on historiography reach their highpoint in the letters and the entry on the conversation with Jacob Burckhardt; some very pertinent aspects of the historian of Basle come out here fully. It is interesting to watch how these two outstanding connoisseurs of the Italian Renaissance—while starting from different premises—came to agree in their condemnation of the pontificate of Leo X. The information contained in the papers on two Catholic German historians, Johannes Janssen and Onno Klopp, is, very welcome, for they have too often been overlooked. A bias against Ranke comes out strongly; it was the idea of presenting a Catholic history of the popes against the volumes of Ranke that prompted Pastor to start on his great work. Still there was probably on such basic questions as the task and the possibilities of the historian more common ground between the two men than Pastor realized.

As for the contribution of the volume under review to a biography of Pastor, no attempt can be made here to elaborate on this topic; suffice it to say, that the volume under review may serve as a starting point in spite of its deficiencies. One point should be mentioned: the reader somewhat versed in archival research is simply overawed by the amount of manuscript material which Pastor read. He himself was duly critical of the

method Ranke used in exploring archives; could Pastor always say the last word? Only further research will give the answer to this question.

It seems appropriate in this review to mention finally that Pastor was offered a chair of history at the Catholic University of America by its first Rector, Bishop Keane, in 1887 and again in 1888. He declined for the reason that he felt he could not prepare for and write the *History of the Popes* in Washington (pp. 203, 210, 215, 217). Among the outstanding honors bestowed on Pastor on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, the speech which Monsignor Peter Guilday gave before the joint session of the American Historical Association and the American Catholic Historical Association in December, 1923, is listed (p. 789).

FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI

*The Catholic University of America*

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

*History of the Diocese of Cleveland. Origin and Growth (1847-1952).* By Michael J. Hynes. (Cleveland: Diocese of Cleveland. 1953. Pp. xxiv, 520. $10.00.)

The possibility of writing an adequate history of the Catholic Church in the United States grows with each publication of a new diocesan history. This work, the result of a special commission to commemorate the centennial (1847-1947) of the Diocese of Cleveland, deserves a place with the best. While not the first history of the diocese to be published, it corrects and supplements the publications of Monsignor Houck, the pioneer historian of Cleveland Catholicism, whose work covered the first fifty years of its existence.

The story of the Diocese of Cleveland provides a good cross section of most of the problems that faced the Church in the various parts of the United States. The language difficulty, the school question, organized anti-Catholicism, the problem of episcopal authority—all found place in Cleveland. Dissatisfaction has long been felt with the earlier treatment of certain aspects of these topics, and it was hoped that this new work would write a final word on some of these disputes. The present author, however, points out that these problems have lost much of their seeming importance, and, therefore, he has not re-opened the discussion. This will disappoint the professional historian. In much of the writing on the history of the American Church too much emphasis has been given to the trials, and too little to the triumphs of the Church. The present author has chosen the better part in accentuating the positive side of the story.

The work is well documented with a plethora of primary sources, and well indexed. The many illustrations are indexed, and the format attractive. The organization into separate treatment of all topics under each bishop leads to some confusion and detracts from the unity of the theme. Although the official limits of the book are 1847-1947, the story has been brought right up to the publication date. This history deserves a place along with the splendid histories of the Archdioceses of St. Louis, Boston, and Detroit.

EDWARD R. VOLLMER

*Saint Louis University*

*Conspiracy in Paris. The Strange Career of Joseph Picot de Limoelan, Aristocrat, Soldier, and Priest, and the Gunpowder Plot against Napoleon on 3 Nivose, Year IX (December 24, 1800).* By David Darrah. (New York: Exposition Press. 1953. Pp. 199. $3.00.)

The career of Father Joseph Picot de Clorivière has fascinated many—among them this reviewer who wrote a master's thesis on that career some years ago under the late Monsignor Guilday. The story of Clorivière has two parts—one that took place in France and the other in America. The part that happened in France was the story of a French royalist, trying to stem the tide of the French Revolution and climaxing his efforts in an attempt on the life of Napoleon. This has always been known as the "affair of the Infernal Machine" or the "attentat de 3 nivose" and it seems uncalled for that Mr. Darrah should use the name "Gunpowder Plot," which in historical writings is applied only to one special incident. The author has made himself quite conversant with the French story. His writing has a fresh touch which indicates his familiarity with its geography, and apparently he was able to visit the ancestral home of Clorivière. He does not, however, seem to add any knowledge not already to be found in printed sources.

When Mr. Darrah comes to give the second part of the story, Clorivière as a layman and a priest in the United States, he shows himself as rather unfamiliar with the subject. He is not aware, e.g., of the circumstances that enabled Clorivière to escape to America—that he came to Savannah, not New York, and that he lived in Savannah and was an active member of the Catholic community there for quite a few years. Neither is he aware of Clorivière's position as an artist; that his miniatures are on display in the Corcoran Art Gallery in Washington, the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, and the Gibbes Art Gallery in Charleston, South Carolina. Nor has he made any new study of Clorivière's life as a priest at Charleston.

Mr. Darrah's bibliography is rather upsetting. It is strange that he does not list Peter Guilday's *Life and Times of John England* (New York, 1927). Yet he repeatedly cites this work, but erroneously ascribes it to the same author's *Life and Times of John Carroll*! Moreover, the bibliography mentions the archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, but the manner of citing them makes one suspect that the author never saw them except as they were referred to in Guilday's volumes. It is difficult to understand how he could have seen the Right Reverend Joseph Mitchell's articles in the *Georgia Laymen's Bulletin* and yet be so vague on the early days of Clorivière in the United States. Certainly Mr. Darrah should have been acquainted with the article on Clorivière by Roche-Heron in the *Review de Bretagne*.

Although the reviewer feels that Clorivière merited a fuller treatment, at least Mr. Darrah has succeeded in having published the first full length biography of one of the most exciting lives in the history of the American Church.

RICHARD C. MADDEN

*St. Andrew's Church*
*Myrtle Beach, South Carolina*

## ANCIENT HISTORY

*A History of Science. Ancient Science through the Golden Age of Greece.* By George Sarton. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1952. Pp. xxvi, 646. $10.00.)

Through his indispensable *Introduction to the History of Science*, and as the founder and editor of *Isis* and *Osiris* and one of their leading contributors, Professor Sarton has acquired an international reputation in the history of science. He has likewise exercised great influence as a stimulating teacher of his subject at Harvard University. The book under review is the first of a series of eight volumes which are intended to cover the history of science from the earliest times to the present. It was Professor Sarton's custom to treat the history of science in a cycle of four courses over a two-year period. Volume I comprises essentially the matter presented in the first half of the course devoted to antiquity. In consigning his lectures to book form, the author has retained many features of the lecture style, including quite personal opinions—and prejudices—and a chattiness which frequently leads into digressions.

The book is divided into three parts: Part One, Oriental and Greek Origins (pp. 3-217), in eight chapters; Part Two, the Fifth Century

(pp. 219-391), in seven chapters; and Part Three (pp. 393-605), in eight chapters. The final chapter takes the form of a short epilogue (pp. 609-612). There is an excellent index (pp. 617-646). The general bibliography is restricted to a few titles only, but considerable bibliography is listed in the copious footnotes, and the author takes for granted that the reader will turn for fuller bibliographical data to the *Introduction to the History of Science, Isis,* and elsewhere. The work is furnished with 103 plates and figures—many of them reproductions of the title pages or first pages of the first editions of Greek texts—and it is beautifully printed.

This volume is a solid, generally well-balanced, and, above all, a very readable history of ancient science through the period of Aristotle. The science of the Near East is treated in a competent and sympathetic fashion, and its role in the development of Greek science is properly emphasized and evaluated. Science is not dealt with in isolation but always as an organic part of cultural life as a whole. The interrelations of science and religion are recognized and stressed, not only in the chapters on the Egyptians and Babylonians, but also in those devoted to the Greeks. The author is more aware of the true nature and limitations of Greek rationalism than many classical philologists and historians of ancient philosophy. Furthermore, it should be noted that he has taken science in a very broad sense. Thus, there is place for a treatment of Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* and of historiography in the fourth century, and considerable attention is given to the ethical doctrines of Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, and Zeno, as well as to their scientific teachings in the stricter sense. While some may object to the generous scope of Sarton's concept of science, the reviewer at least welcomes it. In antiquity, even at the zenith of Greek science in the Hellenistic Age, the same scholar—with the possible exception of certain physicians—was often, or rather usually, engaged in a whole range of intellectual activities from mathematics and astrology to literary criticism and personal poetic composition. Hence, an individual's sicentific contributions in the narrower sense can only be rightly evaluated against a much broader intellectual background and activity than our modern conditions would ordinarily require.

The author has gone directly to the ancient sources for his information and, in the case of the Greek material, he was able to examine the sources first-hand in the original. His work is as accurate as the extant ancient sources permit, and his evaluations are generally objective. However, he finds Plato a quite unsympathetic figure and belittles both the man and his work. His own prejudice, apparently, led him to follow K. P. Popper in attacking Plato. It is a pity that he did not choose to follow W. Jaeger, to whom the present volume is dedicated. He would have served as a much more profound and safer guide.

Apart from this blemish—and it is not a minor one—*A History of Science* is warmly recommended as an outstanding contribution to scholarship and, at the same time, an eminently readable book even for the non-specialist.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

*The Catholic University of America*

*Troy: the Sixth Settlement.* By Carl W. Blegen, John L. Caskey, Marion Rawson. (Princeton: Princeton University Press for the University of Cincinnati. 1953. Volume III, Part 1: Text; Part 2: Plates. Pp. xxix, 418; xxv, 512. $36.00.)

Volumes I and II of this monumental work have already been reviewed in this journal (January, 1952, pp. 468-470, and January, 1953, pp. 439-440). There is no need, therefore, to repeat what has been said regarding its general background, plan, and scope.

Volume III deals with Troy VI, first discovered by W. Dörpfeld in 1893 and 1894. The systematic and exhaustive excavations of the University of Cincinnati Expedition, combined with the data furnished by excavations in Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt during the past fifty years, have added enormously to our knowledge of Troy VI and its culture. Troy VI reveals a cultural break with Troy V that can only be explained by the coming of a new people into the area. The foundation of Troy VI coincided with the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age on the Greek mainland, and Troy VI was destroyed by a great earthquake c. 1300 B.C. Eight distinct phases have been identified in this long period, but, at the same time, cultural continuity in Troy VI has been clearly established. In the Sixth Settlement, Troy reached the zenith of its material and cultural prosperity, as is evidenced especially by the elaborate successive fortification walls and massive buildings of its citadel. A great wealth of pottery has been unearthed, and it has been carefully utilized to shed light on cultural phases and relationships. Both inhumation and cremation were practiced in Troy VI. From the beginning of Troy VI, the domesticated horse was employed and gave its masters a distinct advantage in warfare. The evidence from Mesopotamia, Central Asia Minor, and Egypt, however, does not support the view of the authors that the horse was very important in the field of transportation.

Troy VI was, apparently, a royal stronghold for the ruler of the adjacent areas. Its wealth was based chiefly on agriculture, although it is possible, as the authors suggest, that its control of the passage between Europe and Asia and the routes leading to the Dardanelles on the Asiatic side may

have constituted another source of revenue. The Gray Minyan Ware, found in early Troy VI and on the Greek mainland, would seem to postulate a connection between the invaders of Greece and the founders of Troy VI, but the two peoples, if originally related, then went different ways. Contacts between Troy VI and the Greek mainland only became close in the late phases of Troy VI. Mycenaean imports are then much in evidence, but Troy VI retained her own cultural individuality unmodified by Minoan-Mycenaean influences. It is a curious and striking fact that the excavations yielded very scanty evidence for contacts between Troy VI and central Anatolia, although Troy VI in its last phases was contemporary with the great Hittite Empire created in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C.

The two volumes under review exhibit the same exhaustive treatment of the archaeological evidence, accompanied by the same wealth of illustrations and plans. The copious and splendidly arranged index gives easy control of the enormous mass of details contained in the main text. Volume IV, which will soon be published, will cover the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth settlements, and will thus include Homeric Troy.

It is a pleasure to record that the authors in their foreword promise later, "in a briefer and more general survey, to reconstruct the history of Troy and to consider it in its broader setting."

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE

*The Catholic University of America*

## MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

*The Mind of the Middle Ages: A.D. 200-1500. An Historical Survey.* By Frederick B. Artz. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1953. Pp. xiv, 552, viii. $7.50.)

Since the work of H. O. Taylor no attempt has been made to write a synthesis of the mediaeval mind. This project Mr. Artz has undertaken and has used much secondary material made available over the last several decades. He has expanded the scope of his predecessor to include, horizontally, Byzantinism and Islam and, vertically, poetry, art, music, and science. Admitting that the critical apparatus has been reduced to a minimum, he condenses quotations, even omitting the customary three dots and refers often to secondary sources for primary quotations. More often than not, assertions and developments of thought have no footnote reference and, hence, the book must be accepted or rejected *ex auctoritate*. It is not surprising that the reader is approached by the author, "like St. Denis, with his head in his hands" (p. vii).

This typically mediaeval compendium, drawing from all sorts of lore and filled with fact and fancy, truth and myth, approaches in no respect the clarity of Isidore of Seville. The author does not understand man, nor philosophy, nor the Middle Ages. He leaves out theology because of "lack of space." "Syncretism," "mysticism," "personality," and "reality" are terms concerning which one may vainly search for a clear meaning. Only three illustrations are possible of the confusions in the book.

In the statement, "Asceticism proceeds on the idea that human desire not only in its excess but in its normal operation is evil" (p. 105) the mid-twentieth century mind is exposed, not the mediaeval mind. Of St. Benedict: "The rule describes the monks' vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience" (p. 185). One may read the Benedictine rule in vain search of such vows. The three distinctive vows of St. Benedict are discussed at some length in one of the books listed in the author's bibliographical notes. Though these three supposed vows are repeated in nearly every mediaeval textbook, the evidence is contrary. Again St. Paul "was convinced that Jesus was a divine being, who by his death and resurrection saves those who are united with him by a mystic faith—'salvation by faith,' as the doctrine was to be known in history. . . . It was the result of moral living, of worship, of prayer, of works of charity . . ." (p. 57). This reviewer suggests that the "historic phrase" was "salvation by faith alone" and that the "alone" was inserted into the text 1500 years after St. Paul precisely to deny the necessity for salvation of "moral living" or "works of charity."

Furthermore, the author confounds scholastic theology and philosophy (p. 253), does not present the case for moderate realism, and quotes a scientist to the effect that the *Summa* was a mosaic rather than a synthesis (p. 264). He does not know the facts on the bull *Unam sanctam* (p. 294). He continues the perversion of the "ex opere operato" nature of the sacraments (p. 59). The fallacy of "post hoc, ergo propter hoc" is common (e.g. p. 104). He treats of Islam as though it were a component part of western civilization rather than an influence upon it. His sources on the historicity of the Gospels and the teachings of Jesus Christ are quite unscholarly and out-dated (p. 56), as are his data on the antiquity of the papacy (p. 61).

To those who understand the mediaeval mind this work will not be of any value; to the poor student who is afflicted with it there will not come an understanding. Professors in our universities might encourage their students to enroll in Catholic universities for a summer session of history, theology, or philosophy. In this way new lights for the fall seminar might be provided. This book proves one thing conclusively: indiscriminate con-

tact with books, especially secondary "authorities," cannot beget true learning. We must get back to the sources.

HENRY A. CALLAHAN

*Boston College*

*Archbishop Pecham.* By Decima L. Douie. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 362. $8.50.)

In this her most recent of a number of first rate Franciscan studies Miss Douie has again revealed herself as one of England's most outstanding students of mediaeval Franciscan history. She has undertaken a detailed and difficult study of the career of the only Franciscan Archbishop of Canterbury. Her work has required not only long research in the chronicles and archives of the period, but also an extensive knowledge of mediaeval theology, philosophy, canon and civil law, and literature. In each of these broad and complex fields Miss Douie is at ease. Although she is a devoted admirer of things Franciscan, she never lets this distort her judgments as she evaluates the role of Pecham in his various activities.

Born of a prosperous freeholder family about 1230, Pecham was studying at Oxford when he decided to become a Franciscan. He was transferred to Paris between 1257-1259 for thirteen years and while there he was considered by his order as one of its leading theologians. His interests were broad, indeed, for Pecham wrote commentaries in Scripture and the *Sentences,* poems, hymns, and scientific manuals. The fourteenth century knew him as *doctor ingenuosus.* It was during his years at Paris that the Averroist controversy was raging in all its intensity. Pecham took an active part in it, as well as in an attack on St. Thomas over the nature of the body of Christ between the crucifixion and the resurrection, and the conflict between the mendicant and secular masters. Miss Douie describes clearly the various quarrels and Pecham's role in each.

After teaching three years at Oxford and two years at the curia in Rome, he was unexpectedly chosen Archbishop of Canterbury by Pope Nicholas III in 1279. At the time Pecham was so ill that he had resigned his lectorship in Rome and yet the pope named him in preference to Burnell, the king's own choice, because he wanted a vigorous reformer who would defend ecclesiastical liberties against secular encroachments. Like Langton he was imposed by a reforming pope on a reluctant king. Although accustomed to poverty, Pecham found it most difficult to get accustomed to debt. He had to borrow heavily to defray the cost of his consecration and trip from Rome to England. This was the beginning of the indebtedness which characterized all his years as archbishop; it

was, in fact, nothing unusual: Canterbury was usually in debt. He soon found the burdens of administration so heavy that he wished he had never consented to becoming archbishop. Although Canterbury was one of the wealthiest sees in western Europe and Pecham an able administrator, he still died in debt. Legal expenses seem to have constituted a particularly heavy burden. The traditional revenues of the archbishopric, like those of the king, were no longer sufficient to meet the needs.

Pecham's reforms aimed at pluralism and non-residence, longstanding evils in the English Church, but "as long as Church preferments were the chief means of providing the royal and papal civil servants with their salaries, and the younger sons of magnates with comfortable sinecures, no remedy was possible." The archbishop's commission was also to defend the freedom of the Church guaranteed by *Magna Charta* and to excommunicate offenders. His method of having copies of *Magna Charta* posted on every cathedral and collegiate church as reminders was regarded as an imprudent challenge to the king and withdrawn. The chief source of contention was the curtailment of the courts Christian by means of writs of prohibition. It was the declared policy of the king to limit the jurisdiction of the Church to testamentary and matrimonial cases or purely spiritual ones. The resistance of the English clergy was weak and not a united one, "for many of the royal officials were clerks." Miss Douie describes in detail, and brilliantly, the course of the conflict and Pecham's efforts at reform. If he did not succeed in achieving all his reforms because of ecclesiastical as well as royal opposition, he made important contributions to the legislation of the English Church.

The author also describes the conditions of the Church in England as seen through the reports of the visitations and his various conflicts with the clergy. The frequently exasperating resistance to his efforts at reform tried the patience of this zealous and sometimes caustic archbishop. Mediaevalists will be deeply grateful to Miss Douie for having drawn so carefully and so sharply the career of one who spent "long years of lonely grandeur, unceasing and unrewarding toil, and partial frustration at Canterbury."

JAMES A. CORBETT

*University of Notre Dame*

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*The Earlier Tudors, 1485-1558.* By J. D. Mackie. [Oxford History of England.] (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1952. Pp. xxii, 699. $7.00.)

To undertake a new survey of the Tudor rulers of England from 1485 to 1558 is to assume a difficult task. The printed documentary

material upon which such a study must be based, already plentiful, is constantly increasing in bulk and in diversity. Of unprinted materials there is no end in sight. Besides, many a personality that has enriched this age has received the attention of good biographers. Then there are the treatises dealing with some special aspect of the period as, e.g., Tawney's suggestive essay. Finally are to be noted the accounts by such good scholars as A. D. Innes (1905), A. F. Pollard (1910), and A. L. Fisher (1913). To assimilate this immense mass of historical literature dealing with the political, military, social, literary, academic, religious, and artistic activities of a complex age is a great labor. Professor Mackie's carefully compiled statement covering the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary Tudor is certain to occupy a respected place among the books dealing with the Tudors.

The author divides his subject into sixteen chapters, the first two being devoted to the physical setting of Tudor activity. Henry VII's reign is treated in five chapters, which is proper, for the author correctly regards him as a key figure laying down much of Tudor policy. In the next six chapters he traces the tangled affairs of Henry VIII's reign, so significant in most aspects of national life, but particularly in respect to religion. One chapter is devoted to Edward VI and one to Mary. The reader will note the author's skillful hand, his sharp delineation of characters, and his insight in the problems of the day. Perhaps Chapter XIII which concerns economic development deserves to be singled out as especially instructive.

To Professor Mackie the reigns of these Tudor rulers were an age of "common sense." This was a "practical age," one guided by a sense of "realism." This "empiric" England passed into a "pregnant" age which produced the "nation-state." The crown possessed an "almost unconscious, empiric, feeling for the realities." How to treat the Church as a factor in the culture of this age so presented is a difficult matter. In this matter the reader would do well to peruse Philip Hughes' *The Reformation in England* (New York, 1951). Naturally also the author has difficulty in setting forth in a few paragraphs the characteristics of the "Renaissance." He seems to accept much of Symonds' generalizations on these points. This period, he declares, was a "rebellion of the facts against the theories" (p. 335). But, we would ask, was not the "Renaissance" itself pregnant in theories which conflicted with the "facts" of the Middle Ages, and did not the Renaissance clash with ethics and morality, and even with "reason"? And were not the Middle Ages themselves noted for their use of reason, were not the men of that day gifted with a striking sense of realism as, e.g., in Gothic art? Springing from the same inspiration, perhaps, is the curious idea that the "struggling Italian state which was the papacy obviously bore little resemblance to a world-church,"

and that this was one of those "established ideas and the established institutions" which "became steadily less able to endure criticism" (pp. 3-4).

HENRY S. LUCAS

*University of Washington*

*History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517-1550.* By Henry de Vocht. [Humanistica Louvaniensia, Volumes 10 and 11.] (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire. 1951, 1953. Pp. xii, 662; viii, 694.)

This series published under the high direction of the venerable professor of the University of Louvain comprises studies, rare texts, and unprinted material concerning the history of humanism and of the lives and works of humanists connected with the old University of Louvain. In 1950 he published *Jerome de Busleyden, Founder of the Louvain Collegium Trilingue. His Life and Writings* as a preparation for the present volumes. Since World War I the author has been gathering the material for his work not only in Brussels and Louvain, but at Oxford, London, Upsala, in Germany and in the old centers of Polish culture. He was thus enabled to complete and to correct biographies, identifications, and dates, and to change the generally accepted judgment even of respected authors in some details concerning the original plan and purpose of the founders who established the institute. Professor de Vocht brings out aspects in the university life hitherto not stressed, especially of the men whom Erasmus knew in Louvain. Moreover, he discovered unknown particulars about the training of Richard Fox, the founder of Corpus Christi College at Oxford. The work is a distinct and valuable contribution to the history of the revival of letters in Europe as well as in Louvain. One must admire the courage as well as the scholarship of the author for his painstaking investigation and for his having written in English which is not his native idiom.

Jerome de Busleyden, who had studied at Louvain and at Padua, was an ecclesiastic of considerable means and he held high position in the government councils. He was a patron of letters and maintained a grand residence at Mechlin in Belgium where Erasmus and St. Thomas More were among his guests. He left the bulk of his estate for the purpose of founding a college at Louvain in which the three languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew would be scientifically taught by competent professors. The study of languages was at a low ebb in northern Europe although several of the Louvain colleges had made some attempt to revive it. There was a suspicion of the study of Greek because of its association with heresy

and schism, and of Hebrew, over the study of which a great controversy raged in Germany. Especially after the defection of Luther this suspicion deepened because of the great mistake of identifying the study of languages with rebellion against the Church.

The new method of thought and study as projected by Erasmus for the study of theology became the program for the new school. Knowledge and scientific certitude were based on personal study and research. Textual criticism and the knowledge of the languages he considered important aids in the study of Scripture and of the other sacred and profane sciences. The student of law would study the sources of Roman law, the natural scientist and the physician would study nature and the human body itself. This revolutionary method of study, applied to all branches of human knowledge, was characteristic of Louvain for quite a period. In the beginning the new college met with stubborn opposition on the part of the leading members of the university. It was a question principally of control. The new institute was outside the regular university curriculum, its lectures were open to all and were free. Erasmus counseled the professors to refrain from any reference to the other faculties and to tend strictly to their own business of languages, and before the recognition by the university he had the Hebrew lectures begun in a rented hall. The lessons in the three languages began in September, 1518, in a hall offered by the Augustinians. They were an immediate success. Provisional recognition, later suspended, was given on September 20, 1519. The threat of setting it up outside Louvain, at Bruges or Tournai, and the influence of Cardinal Adrian of Utrecht and of Cardinal William of Croy brought it about that the college became an official part of the university on March 12, 1520. The new institution finally occupied its new quarters, minutely described by the author, which were soon taxed to their capacity.

Though Erasmus did much to conciliate the authorities, and relations with the university became cordial, he himself continued to be attacked despite the orders of Popes Clement VII and Adrian VI, and the imperial decree of Charles V. Erasmus felt the personal attack as made on his favorite institution, and he vigorously rejected any sympathy with Luther or the reformers. The author shows the essential opposition between Erasmus and Luther, especially after it became clear that Luther did not aim at an internal reform of the Church and Erasmus began to realize that Luther was substituting sedition and revolt for quiet study and self-reform. The university was the first to denounce the doctrines of Luther as heretical.

The author gives a detailed account of the first professors and their students who came from many countries drawn by the reputation of the new college and the association of Erasmus with it. The great humanist was much gratified by this success. He dedicated the text of St. John

Chrysostom's *De babyla martyre* to the president of the college, and proposed it as a model for the instruction of youth. Interested in the cultivation of piety and virtue in young students, he gave it as his opinion that pagan authors should be read by "the professors for the sake of the elegant diction rather than be taught to young boys." In his last will he left a complete set of his works to the college. The method of study learned in the institute was carried over to their later studies and produced leaders in theology and the natural sciences. Gemma, considered to be the founder of scientific geography who introduced the new method of finding the longitude of a place with a time piece, was one of these students. His description of the newly discovered America furnished the information for making new maps and globes, a specialty of Louvain. His pupil, Gerard Mercator, was the mapmaker who invented the cylindrical projection which revolutionized navigation enabling the mariner to steer his course by straight lines. The success of the college influenced other countries to establish similar institutions. The Latin professor Goclenius was invited by Cardinal Wolsey to England and by the Danish court to that country. At the instigation of Erasmus, however, he remained at Louvain even though he thereby suffered financial loss.

The volumes are illustrated by several engravings of Jerome Busleyden and of the institute he founded. Three appendices at the end of Volume I contain the critical edition of Matthew Adrianus' *oratio* in favor of the teaching of languages; the *Dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium* composed at Louvain by William Nesen, a sarcastic diatribe against those who opposed the study of languages; and the *Epistola de magistris nostris Lovaniensibus* and the *Vita S. Nicolai*, written by a German author as an attack on the theological faculty of Louvain for their having condemned Luther's doctrines. The paper bound volumes published with the aid of the Belgian Fondation Universitaire are well printed. There is a good index of personalities and a convenient list of abbreviations used in the work which is thoroughly documented.

MICHAEL J. HYNES

*Saint Mary's Seminary*
*Cleveland*

*James Stewart, Earl of Moray: A Political Study of the Reformation in Scotland.* By Maurice Lee, Jr. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1953. Pp. ix, 320. $4.00.)

In this volume Mr. Lee sets himself the task of giving a coherent account of the great political, social, economic, and religious revolution

which transformed Scottish life at the end of the sixteenth century in terms of a biography of James Stewart, Earl of Moray, the illegitimate son of King James V, the ablest of the Scottish nobility of his day, and the acknowledged political leader of the Reformation faction in Scotland. The political aspect of the Scottish Reformation, with its dominant figure, the Earl of Moray, forms one of the most tangled problems that a historian may be called upon to unravel, and only rarely does any historian achieve unimpassioned objectivity in dealing with this theme. The author of this book presents a restrained and very readable narrative of the period, but he cannot be said to have achieved complete judicial impartiality in the treatment of his evidence. From beginning to end, he is always to tip the scales generously in favor of his hero.

The book makes the tortuous politics of sixteenth-century Scotland appear almost simple and intelligible and the activities of James Stewart are made to appear consistently righteous and disinterested. This is achieved by a superficiality of exposition, which possibly does not do justice to the author's insight and research. The period and the chief character of the book are highly controversial and the normal reader is to be forgiven if he does not accept, in every complicated event of the time, that interpretation of the evidence (occasionally somewhat strained) which favors the character and the aims of James Stewart, while alternative interpretations of the same events are dismissed rather cavalierly as opinions held only by "Mary's extreme partisans," "romantics," and "Mariolaters." In one or two instances, the author does admit that there is a lack of legality and straightforwardness in Moray's conduct, but he seems to consider that such aberrations are to be excused because of the immense benefits that were to accrue to posterity from the establishment of Calvinism as the national religion in Scotland, and from the permanent union of Scotland and England. Not everyone would admit the validity of the principle involved here.

The biographer of James Stewart, Earl of Moray, has admittedly a very difficult task, for Moray was notoriously secretive and has left no intimate revelations of his real motives and ambitions. Mr. Lee confesses that he has had recourse, here and there, to conjecture and surmise, but in so doing he invariably attributes the highest motives to Moray. The author threads his way through some of the most controversial incidents of Scottish history—the Huntly Rebellion of 1562, Moray's rebellion of 1565, the murder of David Riccio, the murder of Lord Darnley, Ainslie's Supper Party, the Casket Letters, the treacherous collusion between the Scottish Reformers and the English Government—and he emerges with his hero's character almost unsullied. Not every reader will be convinced. In particular, one would have welcomed an investigation of Moray's vast accumulation of landed property, some of which was acquired in very

dubious circumstances, but these transactions are relegated to a footnote on page 98.

However, since this is the first attempt to provide a full-scale biography of the Earl of Moray, we cannot expect it to be definitive and, although we cannot agree with the author's interpretation of many of the events and actions in the life of James Stewart, yet we must be grateful to him for giving us, within the compass of one volume, a narrative of events as they centered around this very important, if somewhat enigmatic, figure. Moreover, in spite of the defects we have mentioned, this biography does give a very useful picture of the political process by which Protestantism was imposed upon Scotland, and not the least part of its interest lies in the many parallels one can discern between that process and the technique of the ideological revolutionaries of our own day.

Only two misprints have been noticed: "Tarnaway" for "Darnaway" (p. 105) and "murders" for "murderers" (p. 266). As one would expect from the Columbia University Press, the book is excellently produced, though it might have been of advantage if an illustration had been included to show the fine portrait, from the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, which conveys more eloquently than words a sense of James Stewart's strength of character and astuteness.

DAVID MCROBERTS

*St. Peter's College*
*Cardross, Scotland*

*Science and Religion in Elizabethan England.* By Paul H. Kocher. (San Marino: Huntington Library. 1953. Pp. xii, 340. $6.00.)

"Tempting but vain as an alchemist's dream, would be the search for any single formula to enclose the whole interrelationship of Elizabethan science and religion." With this observation Professor Kocher begins the final chapter of his book. Such a judgment is hardly open to question. Nevertheless, no one on reading this masterly exposition of the interplay between these two influences during the latter half of the sixteenth century, can deny its author the credit of having gone far to achieve this end.

The period under review was one of varied intellectual activity. It was the age which brought forth Spenser, Shakespeare, and Ben Jonson in literature. Its contributions to science were no less marked; names like Gilbert of Colchester, Harriot, Francis Bacon, Galileo, Kepler, Harvey remind us of the virility of the passion for inquiry. Fresh discoveries, notably the view that the earth could no longer be regarded as the center of the cosmos, seemed to be at variance with the teachings of the Scrip-

tures, and led men to seek a way of harmonizing natural phenomena with divine revelation.

Scientists, on the whole, have never shown any marked hostility to the teachings of the Church. They are wise enough to recognize their limitations. With great clearness, the author brings this point of view to the front in his chapter on miracles. Here, it would seem, was a real clash between religious and scientific ideas of causation. Miracles are unpredictable. The theologian, realizing how unsearchable are the ways of God, accepts them more readily than the scientist. They are the fulfillment of Christ's promise: ask, and ye shall receive. For no rider is attached to this promise; the granting of our requests is not made subject to the laws of nature being undisturbed thereby. On the other hand, the scientist, committed to the task of seeking order and regularity in nature, is not willing to accept such a view until it has been established that the phenomena have shown themselves unexplainable on natural grounds. He does not reject divine intervention; it is merely that his approach is more cautious. Thus the appearance of the *nova* in Cassiopeia in 1572, or of a comet, was to the theologian a possible manifestation of divine disapproval. The scientist is not so ready to accept this belief. But, the problem of reconciling an order in nature with an order of God was no new thing to the Elizabethans. It had been already fully worked out by Boethius in the *Consolations of Philosophy*, as well as by St. Augustine in the *De civitate Dei*, Book V, and by the great scholastics. Thus although certain kinds of religious attitude seemed hostile to science, the orthodox view held by many Elizabethans was that in the main structure of Elizabethan thought, religion and science were firmly married (p. 323).

As might be expected, Professor Kocher deals exhaustively with the question of witchcraft. "The extent to which Elizabethan medicine bothered about witchcraft and demoniacal possession as genuinely serious possibilities has been vastly overestimated" (p. 136). Such a sweeping statement will not be universally accepted. Pope Innocent VIII gave sanction to the popular belief in the active evil powers of witches and sorcerers, and Catholic and Protestant alike vied with each other in the practice of witch-hunting. Reginald Scot, a Kentish squire, in his *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584) took the common sense view that the whole business was a mixture of ignorance, roguery, and illusion. On the other hand, such great physicians as William Harvey and Sir Thomas Browne actually assisted in the examination of witches.

Professor Kocher concludes that the Elizabethan solution of reconciling religion with science was a fundamentally sound one. One might add that it was the only possible solution. Science, despite its vast achievements, must not be allowed to run wild, but must remember God as its source and final end. We might take comfort from a quotation from the late

A. N. Whitehead, which seems not entirely irrelevant: "The fact of the religious vision, and its history of persistent expansion is our one ground for optimism. Apart from it, human life is a flash of occasional enjoyments, lighting up a mass of pain and misery, a bagatelle of transient experience" (*Science and the Modern World*, p. 238).

Professor Kocher has done his work well. The volume is extremely well documented, and must represent years of profound study. This will be amply repaid by the welcome which will be accorded to this learned and lucid, and possibly provocative, book.

J. F. Scott

*St. Mary's College*
*Strawberry Hill*

*Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581.* By J. E. Neale. (London: Jonathan Cape. 1953. Pp. 434. 25s.)

May I begin this review with a statement that describes my over-all reaction to the book? I read it during a vacation when every day the weather man announced new heat records. Never once was I tempted to turn to something lighter and reserve this book for cooler weather. I mention this interest because Professor Neale feared that his own bias for the age of Elizabeth may have led him into overestimating the fascination it might have for others.

The use of the plural in the title may be taken as a key. Professor Neale points out that for Elizabeth's time, as earlier, the historian "rightly speaks" of "distinct and separate" parliaments, instead of parliament as "one continuum" (p. 409). Yet the modern idea was entering, and in various ways the parliamentary history of the Elizabethan period, as Neale describes it through 1581, illustrates "the significance of the Elizabethan period in the constitutional evolution of England" (p. 11). A subsequent volume will cover the remainder of the reign. Whether Neale treats of procedure in parliament, privileges—especially freedom of speech, the relation between sovereign and parliament upon which much of the book turns, tactics and strategy of parliamentary groups, the Puritans particularly, the connections among members and outside interests such as the Marian exiles or the Puritan divines who, he believes, were responsible for many of the "concerted preparations" and much of the "planning" which underlay "so many of the agitations," Neale has an eye to the later development of parliament. Most of his attention is, naturally, devoted to the House of Commons where occurred the sharpest debates, the bitterest fights, and the most pregnant happenings.

Structurally the book is simple. Each of its seven parts treats of the history of a parliament, and each parliament has its theme, always a

variant on the dominant theme of the period, religion. Sometimes the details become a little difficult to follow, but the main lines are never lost.

The issues encountered by the several parliaments, the religious settlement, the succession and marriage questions, the problem of Mary Queen of Scots, are well known. This book makes its contribution by revealing in detail the parliamentary treatment of them. Exploiting manuscripts and members' diaries, quoting frequently and sometimes at length from versions of speeches that have come down to us, Neale has given a flavorful and often exciting history of these first five Elizabethan parliaments (that of 1572 met again in 1576 and 1581). Yet with all his research and vast knowledge, even Professor Neale has to resort to "probably" and "possibly" in offering explanations which the sources do not supply. Some might complain that such phrases as "in all probability," "we need have little hesitation," or "there is reason to think that she had" occur too frequently, but I liked the author's efforts to deduce reasons and motives. He never attempts to disguise his speculations.

The people in this book were keen and contentious. These Elizabethan parliamentarians learned much about the conduct of public business and they learned rapidly; how much and how fast this book tells us better than any other I know. But the person who gave her name to the age was the greatest figure of them all, and Professor Neale does not hesitate to say so. It would be strange if the biographer of Elizabeth did not. Though he seldom brings Elizabeth onto the stage, he very skillfully makes the reader aware of her hovering presence. Members of parliament were always conscious of it, too. The success of any parliamentary history of the period depends upon the establishment of that fact. How Elizabeth brought her power to bear, how she made known her views and influenced the decisions of parliament, how much, in the case of the recusancy act of 1581, England owes "to her sanity," how "rare" was her "statemanship," how boldly she gambled and won, e.g., that she would live to old age, these matters belong with the drama of the parliamentary history of the period.

CARL B. CONE

*University of Kentucky*

*Galileo Galilei: Dialogue on the Great World Systems, in the Salusbury Translation.* Revised, annotated, and with an introductory by Giorgio de Santillana. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1953. Pp. lviii, 505. $12.50.)

In 1661 a certain Thomas Salusbury published in London an English translation of Galileo's *Dialogo dei massimi sistemi* (1632), most of the

copies of which apparently perished in the Great Fire of 1666. Though exceedingly unreliable, sometimes fantastic in its inaccuracy, it did manage to preserve a measure of the spirit of the original Italian. With good reason then Professor de Santillana (of M.I.T.) has chosen to make it the basis of his own work, not without considerable revision, of course, against the Italian original. To the text he has added numerous footnotes, some directly concerned with a point or phrase of the text, the majority, however, providing the historical background of philosophical or scientific references. The result seems very acceptable; and to clarify for the modern reader the two systems, of Ptolemy and Copernicus, "An Astronomical Note" by William D. Stahlman is added by way of appendix (pp. 475-496). An adequate index closes the book.

Since the *Massimi sistemi* is the work which caused or occasioned the second process against Galileo (1633), Professor de Santillana prefaces the text with a lengthy historical introduction on the life, doctrines, and trials of the father of modern science. As this is a scientific book, it rightly merits a scientific and dignified introduction. It does not receive its due. True, the historical facts are given without too many inaccuracies of detail (the author also promises "The Crime of Galileo" in the near future). But their narration abounds in colloquialisms and slang and is marred by bursts of sarcasm and not a little agnosticism. The air is thick with intrigue, as the "thought-police" (the Holy Office!) contrive by their "secret machinery" to bring their victim to his knees, to save Aristotelianism (and the Church?) at any price.

Human emotions played their part, no doubt, in clouding the issue at the trial; and there is the perennial problem of the authenticity of the injunction supposedly given Galileo in 1616. Yet to make the whole trial appear as a matter of personal hatred, prejudices, hidden forces, legal maneuvers, and to ignore the whole atmosphere of the "dull period" of the Counter Reformation or the viewpoint of the Holy Office, is not good historical writing. Moreover, despite the author's partiality for Galileo, has he grasped the real character of his hero, a man of faith as well as of science, who gave more than verbal and external loyalty to his faith? A man who could write: *Non potendo due verità contraddirsi, è necessario che quella* [of science] *et le Scritture siano concordissime* had hardly to "learn to adjust to (a) new world of absurdity imposed on the faithful . . . (and) create for himself a language of ambiguous and unseizable irony, to believe what he did not believe while thinking what he thought" (p. xxvi). A little more objectivity would go a long way. At least, there is no repetition of the old *Eppur si muove!*

IGNATIUS BRADY

*Franciscan Institute*

*The Triumph of Science and Reason, 1600-1685.* By Frederick L. Nussbaum. (New York: Harper and Bros. 1953. Pp. xiv, 304. $5.00.)

Professor Nussbaum follows the editorical plan of the Rise of Modern Europe series by giving more space and emphasis to cultural history than to political and military events. These traditional topics of history writers cannot supply the unifying element in European history during the twenty-five years covered by the volume since statecraft was irrational and international relations were anarchic. The unifying force is rather to be sought in the victory of Cartesian rationalism whose climax was achieved during the quarter century, 1660-1685, in philosophy, art, the natural and social sciences, and to a lesser degree in literature and religion.

The reader may not agree with the author's relegation of affairs of state to a secondary role, especially for the years covered by the book. It is rather hard to imagine Louis XIV playing on the second team. But there he is. It is a challenging approach to say the least. Many of us who have been using the Harper series in connection with our teaching may even welcome such a point of view. At all events, the book will be gladly added to our collateral reading shelves. The chapter on capitalism is the work of a master of the subject; those that treat of the baroque in art and literature, of religion, and of social development betray an extensive grasp of the secondary literature on the age.

This work, like the other volumes in the series, is based on monographic studies. That being the case, and since Cartesianism is the key to the twenty-five years under discussion, one would expect the working bibliography to contain Henri Gilson's edition of the *Discours de la méthode* with its excellent commentary, the classic work of Paul Hazard, *La crise de la conscience Europeéne,* the pertinent works of Cornelia Serrurier, Jean Laporte, Genviève Lewis, and Henri Busson.

This reviewer likes the prominence given to religion in the book, although he would like to see more than passing reference to the positive work of the Catholic Church on such achievements as seminary training, the works of charity, and the missions. He is, however, grateful to the author for taking religion out of the limbo to which it has been condemned by so many contemporary historians. Unfortunately, most readers will have to know a great deal about Jansenism to understand what the book contains on that subject. A reading of Leibniz's *Consilium Aegypticum* will certainly not lead one to conclude that it "was couched in purely secular and cultural terms" (p. 149). It is hardly correct to speak of Bernini's "convulsions of Saint Teresa" (p. 52), or to say that King John Casimir "devoted the Polish nation to the Virgin" (p. 143), that "The Redemptorist Fathers took Christian slaves to Leghorn" (p. 240),

or that the Jesuits and Capuchins were new orders "born of the Counter Reformation" (p. 180).

VICTOR GELLHAUS

*St. Benedict's College*

*A History of Ireland under the Union, 1801 to 1922: with an Epilogue Carrying the Story down to the Acceptance in 1927 by de Valéra of the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921.* By P. S. O'Hegarty. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.; New York: British Book Centre, Inc. 1952. Pp. xii, 811. $9.50.)

*Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846.* By R. B. McDowell. (London: Faber and Faber Ltd. 1953. Pp. 303. 35s.)

P. S. O'Hegarty has attempted a broad survey of the political history of Ireland since 1800. An old Sinn Feiner who makes no claim to being a trained historian, he has produced in effect a strikingly personal commentary on the activities of Irish political leaders from O'Connell to de Valéra, insofar as they have embodied or fallen short of such nebulous ideas as the "spirit of Ireland" and the "mind of the nation." For nation and nationalism form the theme of this book. Ireland since the Union has been the arena of almost constant agitation, for Catholic emancipation, repeal of the Union, land reform, home rule, separation from England. On the one side has been the "underground nation" of the mere Irish, gradually emerging; on the other the "garrison nation" of the Protestant ascendancy supported by the might of the conqueror, Britain. The former, through its heroes, O'Connell, Davis, Parnell, Griffith, and Collins, and despite the failings of leaders like Redmond and de Valéra, has won the day. Such is the outline of the story, as told in this instance.

Little new information has been added. Indeed, the book is based, with one exception, on readily available printed sources. But it is in the telling, in his many judgments and speculations, that O'Hegarty gives it fresh light—and *heat*. When he deals with persons and events prior to 1902, at which point he himself entered the political lists, there is some effort at detachment. O'Connell, although he failed "to save Ireland's soul" at Clontarf, is presented with admirable understanding and sympathy. And Gladstone emerges "a great man, though an Englishman." Yet the Irish Protestants generally, and the Royal Irish Constabulary in particular, are given a merciless drubbing, and typical of the pervasive Anglophobia is the accusation that the governmental inactivity of England at the time of the great famine constituted "a deliberate policy of extermination" of the Irish. After 1902 such effort at detachment vanishes. Poor Redmond and de Valéra!

The book is long—unnecessarily so, owing to dismayingly protracted quotations sometimes strung over nine or ten pages with only a line or two of interspersed comment, needless repetition of favorite theories about nation and national soul, and obviously hasty writing. Minor errors make it seem longer: the question of a government veto in the appointment of Irish Catholic bishops was not buried "for ever" (p. 28) in 1815, nor was the veto "no more heard of" (p. 30) after 1821; it is not true, as letters in the Peel Papers in the British Museum prove, that O'Connell "fought his hardest" (p. 41) against disfranchisement of the Irish forty-shilling freeholders in 1829; and the Catholic Relief Act of 1793 was not "the first material relaxation of the Penal Laws" (p. 281).

Yet the main themes of the book seem the result of long pondering and are, therefore, challenging. Many of the author's theories, judgments, and speculations, such as those about social classes in Ireland and their part in the rise of the native Irish nation, are convincing. Others, like the historical necessity of combining constitutional agitation with the threat of physical force, are persuasive. Some, especially those conceived in an atmosphere of "soul of the nation" mysticism, like the respectful condemnation of Cardinal Cullen as "a Catholic rather than an Irishman," are unabashedly emotional.

Unlike O'Hegarty, R. B. McDowell is a young Irishman who has not been implicated in the late troubled politics of his country. Moreover, he is a professional historian, a fellow of Trinity College, and a Protestant. Such considerations help to explain how, in presenting the era between the Union and the famine as more than a mere series of conflicts between the government and Irish nationalists, and with a pronounced emphasis on and sympathy for the Anglo-Irish tradition as well as an understanding of Irish nationalist aspirations, he has produced a more balanced appraisal of the period. The book, which is Volume V in Studies in Irish History, is a sequel to McDowell's earlier study in the same series, *Irish Public Opinion, 1750-1800*. One of the few criticisms that might fairly be leveled at both volumes is that the words "public opinion" in each title are inept. The concept in itself is full of snares even for the most discerning historian, especially in dealing with a time and a country, as Ireland from 1750 to 1850, where opinion was so heterogeneous and great swirls of it so inarticulate that to label any segments as "public" is exceedingly dangerous. Nevertheless, title aside, this is one of the best political surveys of the period yet to appear. While giving due weight to incipient Irish nationalism as personified and dominated by O'Connell—of whose character and greatness McDowell gives the keenest analytical summary I have read—(pp. 120-128), it presents also in necessary perspective the activities of the Irish Tory and Whig Parties, the reorganization of the Irish administration, and the laying of the foundations of the Irish poor

law, local government, and educational systems. In addition, it places necessary stress on the many differences between Ireland and England which account for the misgovernment of the then sister island.

One might take exception to incidental details: the rent scheme of the Catholic Association was put into operation not "at the end of 1824" (p. 98) but at the beginning of that year; the initiative for driving O'Connell's critics out of the Repeal Association (p. 255) belongs as much to John O'Connell as to his father; and too often through the book persons unfamiliar to the non-specialist in Irish history are introduced merely by their family name. But again this borders on quibbling when one appraises a study of the sort that will some day, it is to be hoped, enable a modern Lecky to produce the sadly lacking, full-scale history of nineteenth-century Ireland.

JAMES A. REYNOLDS

*Archbishop Stepinac High School*
*White Plains, New York*

*Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality.* By Karl W. Deutsch. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; Cambridge: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 1953. Pp. x, 292. $5.00.)

Appreciating the crucial importance of nationalism throughout the contemporary world, Professor Deutsch urges the need for more "scientific" research into it. Until now, he complains, our knowledge has been mainly confined to "descriptive, intuitive, qualitative and only partly analytical histories." Yet by employing and co-ordinating up-to-date techniques of the several social sciences, and particularly by utilizing statistical methods, "we might eventually get a solid structural and quantitative basis" that would enable us not only to deepen our knowledge of nationalism, but to predict its future. Which is certainly an interesting prospect!

The quantitative measure of nationalism is to be found, according to the author, in the degree of efficient "communication" of all sorts—social, economic, technological, linguistic, cultural, and political—among persons in a given area, and this can be determined statistically. As examples of what may be done, he presents population statistics and charts for Finland, Bohemia, India, and Scotland, indicating in each case, for a century or more, the varying number (1) of town dwellers (who enjoy "intensive" communication with one another), (2) of rural inhabitants (with inferior means of communication), (3) of speakers of a predominant national language, and (4) of speakers of a different language. Then, by combining (1) and (3), and (2) and (4), he distinguishes between

"most active carriers of nationality and national language" and "those most likely to experience national conflict"; and by projecting into the future the trends so established, he presumably shows the "probable incidence and strength" of nationalism in each country, say in 1970 or 2000 A.D.

Frankly, I am sceptical about all this. It overlooks the historic role of an intellectual elite (quite as often with rural as with urban background) in propagating nationalism. It likewise ignores the artificial creation or revival of a nationalist language, such as in Greece or Norway or Ireland. Nationalism is to me a product of propaganda and schooling rather than of population shifts. It is first linguistic and cultural, and then political, and, though the linguistic element can be measured statistically, I do not think the cultural can, nor the historical circumstances surrounding the creation of particular national states.

As an historian, accustomed to concreteness and non-technical terms, I find Professor Deutsch's book hard to follow. It is confessedly abstract, and it is studded with such extraordinary terms as "complementarity," "commensality," and "organizability." Moreover, there seems to be confusion or vagueness in the use of "people," "nation," "nationality," "patriotism," and "nationalism." Thus a common nationality and nationalism are attributed to Switzerland, although it actually contains three nationalities possessing a common patriotism instead of nationalism.

Professor Deutsch modestly admits that the theory attempted in the present volume "can at most tell only part of the story," and he promises to provide us with two supplementary volumes: the one, to deal with historical examples, and the other, to work out the implications of his theory "for an appraisal of the growth and prospects of nationalism in our present industrial age." It is hoped that he will succeed in this broader enterprise, for it should test the validity of his theory of communication and of the statistical methods he advocates in the study of nationalism. In concluding the present study, he says:

> Whether the unification of Western Europe will be a success or not, whether there will be peace between Hindus and Moslems in India, between Jews and Arabs in the Near East . . . are questions which could be answered, I believe, with the help of research methods outlined in this book, but they cannot be measured by much more than empirical guesswork without it.

Until the new methods are fully tested and their value proved, I for one shall continue to cling to the historical method and to be content with guesswork about the future.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES

*Michigan State College*

*Soviet Imperialism: Its Origins and Tactics.* Edited by Waldemar Gurian. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1953. Pp. vii, 166. $3.75.)

In 1951, broadcasting to the Georgian people, Dean Acheson stated that Stalin's policies were a continuation of past Russian tsarist expansion. Professor Michael Karpovich of Harvard answered him with "Russian Imperialism or Communist Aggression?" (*The New Leader*, June 4, 11, 1951). Thus there began here a discussion which had been terminated in Europe over two decades ago when two socialists, Wolodymyr Wynnychenko, former vice-prime minister of the Soviet Ukraine, and Noah Jordania, the president of the exiled Georgian government, demonstrated that Russian communism was a contemporary form of the old Russian imperialism. Currently hardly anything is published on Soviet history or current affairs which does not touch this problem; on the one side are the scholars of Russian origin or Russian influence; on the other, the non-Russians and their partisans. A high point of this discussion was the symposium "Who is the Enemy: Soviet Communism or Russian Imperialism?" conducted in 1952 by Notre Dame's Committee on International Relations. The symposium's papers are presented in this volume with an objective introduction by Professor Gurian, its organizer.

Nicholas S. Timasheff's (Fordham) "Russian Imperialism or Communist Aggression?" is a presentation of official *tsarist* history, the basic concepts of which are also those of the Soviets. He attempts to divorce the old Russian imperialism from contemporary "communist aggression." This is the biased viewpoint of a former tsarist diplomat incapable of approaching objectively the viewpoint of the old imperialism's victims as presented by non-Russian scholars. (Cf. my book, *The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism*, pp. 403-411.) Even if Timasheff disregarded such opinion, he should not have overlooked Berdyaev's idea that ". . . Bolshevism is the third appearance of Russian autocratic imperialism, its first appearance being the Muscovite Tsardom, and its second the Petrine Empire." (*The Origin of Russian Communism*, p. 120.)

Dr. Michael Pap's "The Ukrainian Problem" ably discusses that country's three century-old plight and confirms Berdyaev's opinion made not only in reference to the Ukraine, but also regarding the other non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. However, Richard E. Pipes' "Russian Moslems before and after the Revolution" reflects the Harvard historians. He seriously discusses the "rights" of the *inorodtsy* (i.e., the aliens, the non-Russians) among whom Stolypin included also the Ukrainians! Using even the *Encyclopaedia Americana* [XXVII, 291 (1947)], he could have learned that the Russian administrators applied to Kazakh Moslems the

principle: "There is no other way to manage the Kazakhs except through massacres." So the author is badly mistaken in regarding genocide as the "acme" of the communist system; rather it is a method of Muscovite imperialism used against the non-Russian peoples, later principally against the Jews. I disagree with his statement that the "Tsarist government was not actively interested in the Russification of its Moslem subjects." Neglecting the masses, they russified the Moslem intelligentsia in the universities. The present difference is that the Russian communists start to do it in the primary school. I also disagree with his idea that nowhere in Islam can one find "as large a reservoir of Westernized technically proficient Moslem intelligentsia as in the Soviet Union." He should study recent Moslem history. Also, the use of the term "westernized" is ambiguous as applied to Soviet conditions.

Wiktor Weintraub's excellent "Soviet Cultural Imperialism in Poland" is of the other school and shows how tsarist imperialism is continued by communism. Dr. Ling Nai-Jui's "Tsarist and Soviet Diplomacy in China," in the same vein, presents facts to prove that Russian communist imperialism is a perfection of the old tsarist imperialism. Professor Frederick Barghoorn's article, "The Image of Russia in Soviet Propaganda," gives a fine survey of the ideological concepts of Soviet history. Nevertheless, on the symposium's question, he believes in Soviet Moscow's "Proletarian internationalism and Soviet patriotism" and he falsely evaluates the contemporary slogans of Russian nationalism.

On the whole, Professor Gurian and the University of Notre Dame should be commended warmly for the symposium and this volume. For the first time, an American university has brought together representatives of both viewpoints. At the very least, the monopoly of the tsarist school has been limited, and to American scholars there was here presented both sides of the problem.

ROMAN SMAL-STOCKI

*Marquette University*

## AMERICAN HISTORY

*America Rebels: Narratives of the Patriots.* Edited with an introduction by Richard M. Dorson. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1953. Pp. xi, 347. $5.00.)

One of the by-products of the American Revolution is an astounding number of diaries and narratives of participants or eye witnesses. Quaint in spelling and grammar, they have a charm that is lost when they are edited and modernized. They vary greatly in interest and frankness.

Although in most instances the authors never anticipated their being broadcast to the public, a few were written with an eye to self-justification and eulogy.

*America Rebels* presents fourteen accounts of participants in the Revolution of some phase of the struggle which they experienced in person. Rebel and loyalist, soldier and civilian, minister of religion and physician, maiden and housewife describe the opening shots at Lexington and Concord, the dreadful experiences of prisoners of war, the vicissitudes of loyalists, war at sea and in the West, the fighting at Yorktown, and the post-war experiences of a prisoner marooned in England. Each account is prefaced by a short explanation of the setting, a thumb nail biography of the writer, and comment on the text. There is a general introduction, and a bibliography which lists a few of the diaries and memoirs, and refers the reader to Mathews' exhaustive list; and there are nineteen good illustrations.

While such a volume of experiences mirrors certain phases of the war, it falls short of being a complete coverage. In reality it presupposes a general knowledge of the subject. Without such knowledge the reader would be exposed to the danger of accepting fragments and details as the whole story. For example, unless the reader already knows something of the character of Ethan Allen he might accept his boasting and bombast as truth, and the high flown wording of his supposed challenge to the British commander at Ticonderoga as sober fact.

Every author enjoys the prerogative of selecting as he sees fit from the abundance of the material at hand, and any criticism of his choice would serve little purpose. Nevertheless, we feel free to observe that a better selection from Nicholas Cresswell could have been made, for we can discern no connection between his dissoluteness and the Revolution. Similarly the account of Israel Potter might well have been terminated with the peace of 1783, for, as it stands, it becomes an essay on the poor in London rather than an account of the Revolution. Of the selections given we found the one by Baroness de Riedesel the most interesting; that by Thacher the most literary; that by the Quaker girl, Sally Wister, the most naive and playful. But why was her comment on the probable effect of the war on the Quaker hegemony in Philadelphia not quoted? As each selection is a unit by itself it can be read as an essay or short story.

The substitution of Gates for Gage on page 31 makes the sentence unintelligible and contrary to fact. And the author's conclusion, on page 8, that "clearly the English had a long tradition of sadism behind them," is grossly unfair inasmuch as it ignores the fact a like savagery in military discipline obtained in other armies and countries; and abundant evidence proves that flogging, even to the extent of more than a hundred lashes,

was not unknown in the American army, and that its infliction had the approval of Washington and other generals. Inhuman as it was, it was, nevertheless, the common and accepted procedure. Dr. Dorson's volume adds little to our knowledge of the American Revolution, but it affords entertaining reading for those not conversant with the literature from which he has drawn his selections.

CHARLES H. METZGER

*West Baden College*

*The Complete Madison. His Basic Writings.* Edited and with an introduction by Saul K. Padover. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1953. Pp. ix, 361. $4.00.)

The enticing title of this work leads one to speculate how the "Complete Madison" could be compressed into 361 pages, but superficial inspection painfully reveals that the promise was misleading. Padover admits "separating Madison the intellectual from Madison the statesman," but not until the very last paragraph of his twenty-one-page introduction does he inform the reader that "The term 'Complete' in the title should not be taken in the literal sense of *entireness* [*sic*]," but as covering the essence of Madison's "basic thought." Even this candor is scarcely justification for reducing "Madison the intellectual" to a thin shadow and distorting him through the medium of the editor's introductory appraisal and his curious selections. The former is a confusing bundle of contradictions and misstatements, whereas the latter appears as an attempt to pour the "complete Madison" into a mould of Padover's modern design, probably reflecting his New School for Social Research philosophy.

"Madison's place as an original political thinker [should] be re-established," the author states; yet ". . . neither by profession nor by inclination was he in a position to work out his thought into a rounded and beautifully logical system of thought." Then, this Hobbesian tinge: "Madison knew that the idea of complete human depravity implied the impossibility of self-government," and ". . . he conceived of the government as a kind of jailkeeper whose function it is to see to it that prisoners do not maim or kill each other." Or these choice morsels: "For Madison . . . had a theory of society which certain modern Socialists and Marxists have claimed as being their own," and ". . . Madison specifically formulated his concept of the economic basis of social-political action in terms that are almost Marxist." How does Padover read? Either he misunderstands Marx or else he misinterprets Madison.

Madison's essays in *The Federalist* are reproduced in full, comprising 178 pages, which together with the introduction, index, and fifteen pages entitled "Axioms," but which are not axioms at all but brief extracts from previous selections, total 221 pages, leaving only 140 pages from Madison's other voluminous writings. Even some of these are insignificant in revealing Madison's "basic thought." Consider, e.g., the eighteen pages under the heading of "Social Welfare," from education to temperance, an area in which Madison did not scintillate; or the six separate quotations on Jews, when the entire collection of Madison's writings contains only two unimportant replies to Jewish correspondents; and, on the other hand, the excessive emphasis on the separation of Church and State.

There is no bibliography, and the reference to Gaillard Hunt's *Writings of James Madison* gives it as only seven volumes, instead of nine, but this might be a typographical error, as are the dates on pages 3, 8, and 345. The book appears to be a padded, hurriedly-compiled, and unscholarly work, citing as authority, e.g., Franklin D. Roosevelt with a quotation in a footnote. The whole is in sad contrast to Padover's creditable *The Complete Jefferson* published ten years ago.

GEORGE N. KRAMER

*Loyola University*
*Los Angeles*

*Historic Philadelphia from the Founding until the Early Nineteenth Century.* Edited by Luther P. Eisenhart. [Transactions of the American Philosophical Society held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge, Volume 43, Part I.] (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society. 1953. Pp. 331. $6.00 cloth; $4.00 paper.)

The volume under review is not, as its title might imply, a chronological history of the City of Brotherly Love. Rather, it is a collection of articles concerning those buildings which, as it were, constituted the various stages for the more important acts of early Philadelphia history. As is evident, the buildings in question attained prominence only by reason of the life they once embraced, and their history necessarily re-enacts (but only by way of reference) many events of vast importance in the history of both Philadelphia and the United States. One needs but mention Independence Hall, Carpenter's Hall, Philosophical Hall, Franklin's House, 190 High Street, the Churches of Saint Joseph and Saint Mary, Christ Church, etc., and the minds of most Americans light up with memories of the early events connected with the birth and growth of the nation.

The articles or projects which make up this volume cover practically every phase of public human life. In a word, they deal with the buildings most prominent in the political, financial, religious, cultural, and recreaitonal history of Philadelphia. For the most part they are written by eminently qualified authors, among whom we might mention Edward M. Riley, chief park historian, Independence National Historical Park Project; William E. Lingelbach, librarian, American Philosophical Society; and Charles E. Peterson, resident architect, Independence National Historical Park Project.

In the majority of the articles there are ample references to primary sources, and it is only in isolated instances that the reader finds a definite lack in this regard. Such is true, e.g., in the treatment of "Saint George's Church," by Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, and "The Second Bank of the United States," by Bray Hammond, not to mention one or two others that also leave something to be desired in the field of documentation.

This volume will have little popular appeal because of the scientific treatment of its subject, but this is not the purpose for which it was edited. Its value lies in its compilation into one readable volume of an accurate history of those buildings in Philadelphia which many historians are convinced should be preserved, or restored, as national shrines. Through this work many others will undoubtedly be led to the same conviction.

CLETUS J. BENJAMIN

*Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul*
*Philadelphia*

*Rendezvous with Destiny. A History of Modern American Reform.* By Eric F. Goldman. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1952. Pp. xiii, 503, xxxvii. $5.00.)

This work has very rightly been acclaimed as a brilliant synthesis. It is a narrative told by a "liberal," but it is in the best historical method based on relevant research, which is indicated in footnotes for more direct citations or listed in the critically annotated bibliographical notes arranged by chapters at the end of the book. The author's choice of ideological case-histories is always colorful in selection and vivid in relation. Sometimes it is merely social history in *New Yorker* style with a break to answer the question once framed even by the author, "And the progressive in the midst of all this?" (p. 304). Yet the primary aim is achieved, viz., of bringing together interpretatively what is drawn from an extensive

study of printed materials, the examination of some few manuscript collections, the zealous consultation of an extraordinary number of unpublished studies (many still in the authors' hands), and from the use of correspondence and interviews with participants in the events described. The last device suffers from being undated. The conclusions of an original break-down of the voting records in Congress are utilized to establish the relationship of progressivism and isolationism in the period of both world wars.

Such a story was obviously a complex one to weave together and the elusiveness of terms like "liberal" and "progressive" did not make it any easier to delineate. The Fair Deal roots are found in post-Civil War industrial America and the work consequently begins with a sympathetic look at the Tilden-type patrician reformer. The discontent of the 1880's, however, was to be hardly satisfied with a liberalism of anti-Grantism which professed that the government was to treat all groups in society equally. The impatience which resulted in the well-described efforts of the Populists gave way to the progressivism at the turn of the century in the strict sense which blended the patrician and agricultural discontent. From the figure of Henry George, whose influence is so prominently featured throughout this work, one moves on to meet, in their liberal guise, such figures as Herbert Croly and Teddy Roosevelt, and later others like Brandeis, Wilson, Darrow, Lippmann, and similar household names in the American liberal tradition. With the "second honeymoon" of the New Deal, the author finds liberalism returned to a full blown social and economic reformism which used the government for serving the welfare of the individual and which caught on with the American mind like no reform movement ever had before. By the same analysis the Truman period found liberalism become a kind of conservatism and the federal government's concern with standards of living and American participation in international collective security taken for granted. This work, in short, presents a history of the United States since the late nineteenth century in a manner that will seem the only significant way to view it to anyone with liberal-gaited glands.

Little corners of such a broad field may well be weeded by reviewers. The position given to populist influence would seem to overshadow the labor reformist groups with whom such notions as the workers being the "producers of wealth" had already become axiomatic (pp. 49-51). A nexus rather than mere assertion would seem to be called for in the allegation that pragmatism gave encouragement to American reformers (p. 159). In matters Catholic, the absence of printed material may be called to mind as excusing the author, but Catholic reform elements, beginning

actually with reactions to the upheavals of the 1870's, were heard from more than is hinted at before the days of John A. Ryan (p. 111).

In other points of Catholic interest, it is more a question of interpretation. The term, "segregated school system" (p. 441), is as loaded an expression as the Catholic counterpart, "Godless state schools." To term the Blanchard work, "the first important liberal criticism of the way the Catholic hierarchy was functioning in the United States" (p. 454), reveals not only a state of mind liberally distrustful of Catholicism but a lack of information as serious as that shown by calling—with no warning qualifications—the Gompers and Powderly autobiographies "of great value" (p. 467). If Catholic votes in Congress on the school question are considered an example of group interest offending the progressive cause (p. 444), it should have been pointed out that, perhaps, as another result of Catholic teachings the same votes on other liberal measures have been more than normally found in the progressive column. Throughout this work Jews, especially, and Negroes too, receive their share of attention, usually as touchstones to test liberals; but persecuted Catholics, as well as liberal Catholics, are minimized by omission (p. 300). The author probably thinks—and who will deny it?—that American Catholics particularly need the message of his opening pages that "to slur over the distinction between reform and socialist objectives is to miss a key fact about the whole history of modern American dissidence" (pp. ix-x). On the other hand, it has never been as bad in Catholic circles as the author would seem to believe when he speaks creduously of the myth of Monsignor Ryan's "daily excursions close to excommunication" (p. 111). So much depends on where one stands, for this reviewer was even of the opinion that the calliope never tooted in Truman's inauguration parade (p. 426).

HENRY J. BROWNE

*The Catholic University of America*

*William L. Wilson and Tariff Reform: A Biography.* By Festus P. Summers. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1953. Pp. x, 288. $5.00.)

William Lyne Wilson, congressional leader (1883-1894), postmaster-general (1895-1897), president of Washington and Lee University (1897-1900), fares well at the hands of his first biographer, Festus P. Summers. The author, drawing heavily upon the Wilson diary and widely scattered Wilson letters, tells an interesting story which is carefully documented.

Although Wilson's claim to statesmanship rests on his prominence as tariff reform leader and defender of traditional democracy during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the author regards his subject as an important chapter in the perennial conflict between Hamiltonian federalism and Jeffersonian democracy. By highlighting Wilson's life-time crusade for tariff reform based on a political philosophy whose chief ingredients were "nineteenth century individualism as enuntiated by Thomas Jefferson . . . , the laissez-faire doctrines of Adam Smith . . . , Social Darwinism as elucidated by Herbert Spencer" (p. 95), the author has fashioned a better than average political biography.

This volume, however, ranges through a wider and a more fertile field than is suggested in the title. It is an analysis of an old theme, "the scholar in politics." Winning a seat in the national House of Representatives by a plurality of ten votes in 1883, Wilson brought to the Hill a lawyer's mind and an administrator's will. Both had been matured and strengthened by three years of service in the Confederate cavalry. Wilson soon manifested traits of great sociability, geniality, and sympathy. While popular, respected, and even feared in Washington, his constituency in the second West Virginia district took pride in his learning and integrity. What was written of Senator Henry G. Davis, a West Virginia contemporary, could equally well have been spoken of Wilson: "He worked as if he expected to live forever, he lived as if he expected to die tomorrow" (p. 41).

Two-thirds of the book are devoted to Wilson's congressional leadership of the tariff reform movement so characteristic of the Democrats during the Cleveland incumbency. Wilson made a slow start, and his first term and half in Congress was dull and inconspicuous. In 1887 Wilson found himself, and played an important part in the effort of the Cleveland Democracy to join New England and the South in political union. The cement, of course, was mutually beneficial, downward revision of the protective tariff. Wilson's task was no easy one, as the tariff debates on the house floor became extremely bitter. His chief and most voluble opponent was "Czar" Reed whose "rasping, sneering sarcasm" fired Wilson's tongue to replies in kind. Scholarly urbanity seems to have been sloughed off, and from all accounts Wilson's own "rapier of satire and repartee" equalled Reed's. In 1888 Wilson supported the Mills Bill in Congress and championed it on the stump during the presidential campaign. His flow of oratory did not keep Harrison and the Republicans, the party of protection, from a victory in November. Four years later, 1892, Wilson was still "talking tariff with a will," having already openly embraced the doctrine that protection was unconstitutional. With Cleveland's return to the White House, Wilson was commissioned "to make his bill." Consequently, with reform at high tide the West Virginia

congressman put through the Wilson Bill. Its chief features were the free admission of raw materials like coal, iron ore, and lumber, and a conservative reduction on manufactured articles. The spirit of drama and excitement of these days are recaptured by Professor Summers (pp. 152-186).

In the end Wilson fought a losing battle, and in the Republican landslide of 1894, he failed of re-election. According to Professor Summers the essence of Wilson's tragedy was that "he had fought the last battle as a confirmed conservative rather than as a humanitarian liberal" (p. 249). He ended his days as a "Gold Democrat," and ironically enough, by escaping the Bryanism of his party, he found himself contributing a half-ballot for McKinley and protection in the election of 1896. All in all, Wilson was a rare spirit whose scholarly brilliance and devotion to duty made combat in the political arena quite difficult. Those who want a better understanding of the intellectual and moral forces behind free enterprise and free government should read this volume. A serviceable bibliography and an accurate index crown a careful and valuable work.

HARRY J. SIEVERS

*West Baden College*

*This Was Publishing.* By Donald Sheehan (Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 1952. Pp. xiv, 288. $3.75.)

Mr. Sheehan has sub-titled his book "A Chronicle of the Book Trade in the Gilded Age," and that is about as good a description of the work as any. The "gilded age" was roughly the period between the Civil War and World War I—a period whose business ethics were personified in Jay Gould, Jim Fisk, and other industrial pirates. Happily, the author finds that the ethics of publishing were a cut above those of the business world generally. But there was, and is, some question as to whether publishing is properly a business. Charles Scribner is quoted as having said that it is "neither a business nor a profession. It is a career."

The material for this book came mainly from the records of Charles Scribners Sons, Harper and Brothers, Henry Holt and Company, Dodd and Meade, and the files of *Publishers Weekly*. By and large the story told by the records is not discreditable. The ideals of the publishers were high, although the reader may be hard put to say why. Walter Page's "A good book is a Big Thing . . . Here is a chance for reverence," is not quite enough by way of reason or explanation. As a matter of fact, the author discloses that by the turn of the century, trade leaders were applying to manuscripts the "single test of marketability."

To one who has even slight knowledge of present-day publishing the problems of publishers in the period covered look much like the problems of publishers today. The publishing of each single title was a chance; it still is. Publishers were having difficulty making sufficient profit from the ordinary book to carry on; they still are. Authors complained of small sales and too low royalties; they still do. Aggressive, intelligent retailers were not too numerous; they are still rare enough. Publishers, retailers, and authors were continually sending up wails of despair—continually on the verge of bankruptcy—always about to go into some other, profitable, business. Actually, of course, they went on publishing, selling, and writing, which gives some hope that present-day wails will lead to no drastic measures.

Possibly the most marked changes in the publishing business came as a result of the passage of the International Copyright Act in 1892, and the "discovery" of book advertising. Earlier in the "gilded age" a substantial part of the book output was made up of pirated English works. Some of the more ethically-minded Americans did, indeed, pay "honorariums" to the English authors and publishers whose works they took. But too many produced them with no consideration whatever, with a consequent loss to the foreign owners and an almost insuperable competition for American authors. The passing of the "pirates" left the regular publishers in a scramble for authors, and the authors in a vastly improved bargaining situation. It was, indeed, a major change. The "discovery" of advertising came about the same time—apparently in an effort to please and to attract the now valuable authors. From practically nothing in 1865, book trade advertising had grown to five million dollars by 1900. Even so, however, Henry Holt was of the opinion that the whole thing was a mistake. The trend continued despite all questions of the actual effect of advertising on sales. Today the "boomed" book is a commonplace.

Mr. Sheehan, who teaches history at Smith College, has evidently written this book out of his own interest in publishing. It has some importance to those who wish to understand the backgrounds of American publishing; and it will interest others who are curious about the business, as who isn't?

ALOYSIUS CROFT

*Bruce Publishing Company*

*The Economic Thought of Monsignor John A. Ryan.* By Patrick W. Gearty (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1953. Pp. viii, 341. $4.00.)

John A. Ryan has been called the prophet of social justice, and very properly so. Few men labored so persistently and so effectively to further

the cause of social justice. And unlike the traditional prophet, he had the gratification, as he neared the end of his career, to see many of his specific proposals become actualities, and to have his basic ideas sanctioned in the encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* of Pius XI.

As a young seminarian in 1892 Ryan had noted in his journals that the labor and social questions offered a distinct challenge to the preachers of Christ's Gospel, and that the Church would have to shift its efforts from taking care of those already impoverished to striving to check wholesale robbery and starvation. That is the task to which he devoted his life. In this course he had the explicit encouragement in the exhortation of Leo XIII in *Rerum novarum*. But while *Rerum novarum* had been issued in 1891, Ryan did not become familiar with it until 1894; the inspirations for the thoughts he confided in his journal were rather the thinking of the Irish immigrant farming community in Minnesota where he was reared, the reforms urged by the Farmers Alliance, Knights of Labor, and similar groups, the eloquence of Ignatius Donnelly, and the staunch democracy of Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Gibbons. Nonetheless, it was stimulating to know that during his priestly career he was pursuing a course indicated by the Holy Father.

Ryan was primarily a moral theologian, making special application of ethics to economics. Others had approached the subject with the purpose of discovering laws governing these activities of men just as other students had discovered the laws controlling the conduct of the physical world. Such laws, e.g., the "iron law of wages," revered as being as inexorable as laws on the action of gases, seemingly justified the deplorable condition of propertyless workingmen and the revolution-breeding maldistribution of wealth. Other some, trained to a philosophical approach, spoke in generalities and in terms with no relevance to current conditions. Still others, with poor philosophical training, applied perverted basic principles to the world they saw, and spawned pernicious explanations and programs. But Father Ryan combined thorough and sound ethical training with diligent study of the facts of economic life to propound principles and programs that had both relevance and essential justice. Ryan kept central in his thinking the dignity and essential purpose of every man, but man necessarily living in society. Man, by his nature, has rights; society, a natural institution, also has rights. The goal, therefore, is the welfare of the social organism—the group and the individual members who compose it. The development of the principles of social, distributive justice was Monsignor Ryan's great contribution. And this is what this book analyzes and presents clearly and effectively. As an economist, Ryan was much influenced by the institutional economics of Ely and the under-consumption theories of Hobson. But as Father Gearty's study reveals, Ryan's first love was not economics, but justice,

a justice that would preserve and enhance the worth of human beings, especially the victims of unrestrained historic capitalism in danger of being enticed by socialism or other totalitarian systems which made naught of the dignity and worth of a man.

This study would have been improved by more specific correlation of the development of Ryan's thinking with the facts of life as Ryan saw them through the years. Also a study of his economic thought might well have included more specific comparison of it with that of other economists, specifically, for instance, his ideas of justice as compared with those of other theologians. The index, also, leaves something to be desired. But this is a good study of the development of John A. Ryan's concepts of social justice.

P. Raymond Nielson

*The Creighton University*

*The China Tangle. The American Effort in China from Pearl Harbor to the Marshall Mission.* By Herbert Feis. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1953. Pp. x, 445. $6.00.)

Here is a book which deserves a reading now by all those seriously interested in the foreign affairs of the United States. It is, moreover, a book which will be consulted and quoted for many years to come. It deals with the highly controversial topic of American relations with China after the entrance of the United States into World War II and carries the story through V-J Day and the months which immediately followed. As is well known, the controversy has arisen over the responsibility for the greatest and most tragic defeat in the entire course of the foreign relations of the United States, viz., the communist triumph in China. Dr. Feis has had excellent preparation for stating and throwing light on the moot issues. First class academic training, service with the government in various posts, some of which afforded him intimate familiarity with the Far East, membership in the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study, and the research entailed in writing *The Road to Pearl Harbor*—all have combined to give him unusual equipment for his latest task. In setting himself to it he used the mountainous material already in print, had access to important unpublished documents and records, and talked with some of the chief American participants. He has asked the right questions and to a remarkable degree has been objective in suggesting the answers. At times he refuses to venture an answer. He also points out some of the areas where further research is still needed and topics for which his limitations of space have estopped him from giving an adequate

coverage. Here is a book to which one can confidently go if he wishes light on American military aid to China, the discussions of plans for the recovery of Burma, the defeat of Japan in the China sector, the policies, achievements, and miscarriage of plans connected with such names as Stillwell, Wiedemeyer, Gauss, and Hurley, the efforts down to the Marshall Mission to resolve the tensions between the Nationalist government and the communists, and the origins, formulation, and immediate sequels of the Yalta agreement. The sad story of the incorrect estimate of the Chinese communists is given, and without committing himself to their genuineness, the author notes the repeated disavowals of Chinese communists by Stalin and Molotov to American representatives. He traces, as the connecting thread in all the tangled skein of American policies and action, the desire to support China against the common enemy, to help her become a united and independent country, to obtain for her a place of great authority among the nations, and to have in her a free, strong, democratic, and friendly nation which would be a partner in assuring peace in the Far East. He recognizes the American failure, but he does not ascribe it to any one person or to a sinister conspiracy.

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

*Yale University*

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

Announcement was made in mid-November by St. Louis University of its plans for the construction on its campus of the Pope Pius XII Memorial Library to house the microfilms of the manuscript collections of the Vatican Library, the work on which was begun last year. The new library will cost between four and five million dollars and will be fully equipped with all the latest devices to aid research workers who wish to consult the wide range of materials contained in the Vatican manuscript collections.

The James Ford Bell Room in the library at the University of Minnesota was dedicated and opened to the public on October 30. The afternoon dedication program featured a symposium on "Book Collecting and Scholarship," with Dean Theodore Blegen acting as moderator, and Colton Storm, Stanley Pargellis, and Louis B. Wright participating. A large banquet audience heard remarks by Frank P. Leslie, President of the Friends of the Library, Mr. Bell, and President J. L. Morrill, and an address by Edward Weeks. The James Ford Bell Room, a replica of an Elizabethan library, houses an outstanding collection of rare books pertaining to the age of discovery which is especially strong in the exploration of eastern Canada and the Great Lakes region. It is open to scholars doing research in this field. Prospective readers should address correspondence to John Parker, Curator.

The Carnegie Corporation has recently made a grant of $75,000 over a five-year period to facilitate social science research on Philippine problems, with the Department of Anthropology of the University of Chicago, the Edward E. Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, and the Chicago Natural History Museum as participants. Two committees are in charge: a policy committee, headed by Fred Eggan of the Department of Anthropology of the University of Chicago, whose membership includes Sol Tax, E. D. Hester, and Harvey Perloff of the University of Chicago and Stanley Pargellis and Ruth Lapham Butler of the Newberry Library, and an advisory committee consisting presently of Fay-Cooper Cole, Felix Keesing, H. H. Bartlett, Paul Russell, and Leopold Ruiz.

The cultural anthropology aspects of the program will be carried out at the University of Chicago and at the Chicago Natural History Museum, which has a large ethnographic collection on the non-Christian peoples of the Philippines. The Ayer Collection at the Newberry Library possesses an extensive ethnographic collection including many linguistic

items, printed works as well as manuscripts (Doris Varner Welsh's *Checklist of Philippine Linguistics in the Newberry Library*, 1950). Professor Eggan's seminar is studying the pattern of certain social and cultural changes in the mountain province, northern Luzon, preparatory to undertaking a group field project in co-operation with Philippine universities.

The historical aspects of the program are centered at the Newberry Library. The Philippine collection of printed works and manuscripts in the Ayer Collection may be unsurpassed as an unfortunate result of recent widespread devastation of Philippine libraries and archives. Paul S. Lietz, chairman of the Department of History of Loyola University, Chicago, has been appointed a Fellow in Philippine Studies at the Newberry Library to calendar the Philippine documents of the Spanish period, a collection of over 200 listed items, some of which are single manuscripts while others contain more than fifty documents, many of which have never before been studied. Many of these items are originals; others are copies or transcripts of originals which have since been lost. In addition to the calendar some of the more important items will be edited for publication.

John Leddy Phelan has also been appointed a Fellow in Philippine Studies to write a monograph on the missionary Church during the first century of the Spanish colony. Mr. Phelan's study of the "spiritual conquest" of the Philippines will stress the contrasts and the analogies between the Spanish missionary enterprise in Asia and in America.

A new organization to promote interest in Latin America, the Council on Inter-American Studies, Middle Atlantic Group, has recently been incorporated in Washington, D. C., with unofficial representatives from the government, the Pan American Union, and the several universities of the Washington area. Members of the council include Margaret Bates, Aníbal Buitrón, Miron Burgin, Manoel Cardozo, Howard Cline, Theodore R. Crevenna, Harold E. Davis, Calvert L. Dedrick, Henry Grattan Doyle, José Gómez-Sicre, John Harrison, Estellita Hart, David Heft, Richard F. Heindel, Margarie Johnston, F. Webster McBryde, Henry Mendeloff, Aníbel Sánchez Reulet, Charles Seeger, and Mark Hanna Watkins. Dr. Davis is chairman of the council, Dr. McBryde, secretary, and Dr. Cline, treasurer.

The growth of the contemplative movement in the Catholic Church of the United States in recent years was emphasized in the sermon at the blessing of Gerard McGinley, O.C.S.O., as the new abbot of Our Lady of Genesee in the Diocese of Rochester in early November. Abbot James Fox of the Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani preached on the occasion and stated that the three American Cistercian abbeys of 1944 had now

increased to nine and that there are now 915 monks as compared with the 352 of nine years ago.

A brochure of fifty pages entitled, *A Brief Biographical Dictionary of the Marist Hierarchy (1836-1953)* has been edited by Nicholas A. Weber, S.M., professor of church history in the Marist College, Washington. Biographical sketches are given of all the Marist bishops from William Douarre, Vicar Apostolic of New Caledonia (1847-1853), who was the first member of the congregation to be raised to the episcopacy, to the American-born Bishop Thomas Wade, who has served since 1930 as Vicar Apostolic of the North Solomon Islands. The thirty-three prelates included in the brochure number three archbishops and eight Marists who have served as residential bishops, among them James Mangers, S.M., who was named Bishop of Oslo when Pope Pius XII restored the hierarchy in Norway last year.

The *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science for July, 1953, is devoted to "NATO and World Peace," and the September issue to "Congress and Foreign Relations."

An interesting article on the research possibilities for the history of modern English Catholicism appeared in the October 17 issue of *The Tablet* of London. It was entitled "A Neglected Heritage. English Recusant Archives in the Low Countries," and was written by Alphonsus Bonnar, O.F.M., of St. Bonaventure's House of Studies at Cambridge. Father Alphonsus pointed out the archival riches existent in the ecclesiastical and civil archives of northern France and Belgium and noted the dangers of further losses unless something is done to secure copies of these English Catholic records dating from the sixteenth century to the French Revolution. He made a special appeal to students who might be seeking topics for their graduate theses, and he remarked, "There is material for a hundred research dissertations on the English Catholic recusants in the Low Countries."

Using its rich library resources in the history of higher education in the Middle Ages, the Mediaeval Institute of the University of Notre Dame has inaugurated a new series of publications entitled: Texts and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education. The series will be edited by Canon A. L. Gabriel and Father Joseph N. Garvin, C.S.C. The first number, a thirty-four page study by James John, is entitled: *The College of Prémontré in Mediaeval Paris.* The author after completing his studies for the M.A. in the Mediaeval Institute became a research assistant to Dr. E. A. Lowe in the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. Father

Gabriel is preparing a history of Ave Maria College in Paris and will spend January and February doing research in Europe.

The *Analecta Augustiniana,* which just completed its Volume XXII, contains a long and masterly article on the life and works of Augustinus Triumphus of Ancona by P. B. Ministeri. The author proves that Augustinus did not die at the age of eighty, but in his late fifties (1328). More than 315 manuscripts of his works resting in various European and American libraries contain thirty-two authentic, eight doubtful, and twenty-one spurious works. The *Analecta,* a Latin publication, is edited by David Gutierrez, O.E.S.A., Via S. Uffizio 25, Rome (9).

The *Archivo Agustiniano,* formerly called *Archivo Histórico Agustiniano,* re-appeared in 1950 after it had been suppressed during the Spanish Civil War. The only complete copy known to exist in the United States is that at the Augustinian Historical Institute, 3103 Arlington Avenue, New York City 63. During their occupation of the Monastery El Escorial communists destroyed the entire stock of the first forty-three volumes. The *Archivo Agustiniano* serves exclusively the history of the Spanish provinces of the order and their work in South America, the Philippines, and China.

The only modern language magazine for the history of the entire Augustinian Order was launched in 1950. It is called *Augustiniana* and is published at Parkbosstraat 1, Heverlee-Leuven, Belgium. One of its main features is a complete annual bibliography on St. Augustine and the history of the Augustinian Order. It appears four times a year and its price is $3.00.

The first volume of *Anthologica annua,* published by the Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos and printed in Spain, has been issued from the Iglesia Nacional Española de Santiago y Montserrat in Rome. In its 500 pages it presents five substantial articles, a collection of documents, and a catalogue of theological manuscripts in the chapter library of Palencia. Three of the articles are historical in nature. Demetrio Mansilla writes on "El cardenal hispano Pelago Gaitán (1206-1230)." Using the papal registers the author traces the activity of this thirteenth-century Spanish cardinal on papal missions and in the curia. Justo Fernandez presents a sketch of the life of Don Francisco de Prats and his career under Alexander VI as papal collector and first permanent nuncio to Spain. He edits thirty-seven documents in an appendix. Joseph Zunzunegui writes on the relations of the apostolic camera with the Kingdom of Castile under Innocent VI. He includes eleven documents

from the Vatican Archives. Miguel Roca edits ninety-three documents concerning Michael Baius. He hopes eventually to edit the complete *Baiana.* Among the articles promised for the second volume are a study of the sources of the *Partidas* of Alfonso the Wise and one on the papal collectorate in Spain from 1471 to 1477. The Instituto plans further to publish documents in a series entitled, Monumenta Hispaniae Vaticana, as well as a series of monographs.

The beginnings of *Anthologica annua* are very auspicious. Exchanges with scientific publications of a similar nature are invited, but there is no indication of a subscription price. Correspondence should be directed to Father Maximino Romero de Lema, Rector del Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos, Via Giulia, 151, Rome.

Since 1793 Cardinal Mendoza has been credited with the publication of a catechetical work called *Catechismus pro Judaeorum conversione* which was allegedly printed about 1478 at Seville. A book would not bear the title of catechism at that time. There can be little doubt that the book which in 1793 was called the catechism of Cardinal Mendoza was Camara's *Epythoma de sacramentis cum tractatu de doctrina Christiana,* printed at Seville in 1487-1488, *auctoritate officiali Cardinalis Hispani* (i.e., Mendoza). In the second edition of this work, the *Tractatus de doctrina Christiana* comprises eighty-two pages and is said to have been written for the instruction of young clerics. Accordingly, Cardinal Mendoza did not first introduce the name of catechism into literature, nor did he write the first Catholic catechetical book called catechism.

A new edition of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* is in preparation, according to an announcement of the publishers, Herder & Co. of Freiburg i. Br. The ten volumes of the second edition of this excellent encyclopaedia appeared between 1930 and 1938.

Since 1950 three volumes of the *Dogmengeschichte der Fruescholastik* by Artur Landgraf have been published by Pustet in Regensburg. The author, now the auxiliary bishop of Bamberg, was a professor of dogmatic theology at the Catholic University of America. The present work, to be completed in six volumes, will contain the fruits of his long research in the manuscript literature of early scholasticism, on which Bishop Landgraf is the acknowledged authority.

Thanks to the Bollingen Foundation the valuable work of Ernst Robert Curtius is now available in English translation from the German original under the title: *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages.* The

translator is Willard R. Trask. Pantheon Books has published the volume at the reduced price of $5.50.

Volume IV (1953) of *Marian Studies* published by the Mariological Society of America (National Headquarters, Holy Name College, Washington, D. C.) contains two articles of an historical nature. Malachi J. Donnelly, S.J., writes on the queenship of Mary during the patristic period and William F. Hill, S.S., on her queenship in the Middle Ages.

Recent changes among the historians at Canisius College include the appointment of Nicholas J. Sullivan, S.J., as head of the Department of History, Edward W. Berbusse, S.J., to take charge of the extension department, while Herbert J. Clancy, S.J., remains as director of graduate studies.

Recent additions to the department of history at Loyola University, Chicago, include Robert McCluggage, who finished his work in American history at the University of Wisconsin.

Francis A. Arlinghaus, professor of history and director of the McNichols Road Evening Division in the University of Detroit, has been on leave, to January 1, 1954, to serve as a member of the civilian faculty of the National War College in Washington, D. C. Mr. Arlinghaus served as President of the American Catholic Historical Association in 1948.

Vincent F. Holden, C.S.P., has been designated by the Paulist Fathers to write the biography of their founder, Isaac T. Hecker, C.S.P. Father Holden, now archivist of his community at the Paulist Motherhouse, 415 W. 59th Street, New York City 19, intends to complete the work by 1958, the year of the Paulist Fathers' centenary. In 1939 he published *The Early Years of Isaac Thomas Hecker,* a volume which covered the Brook Farm episode and the friendship with Brownson, ending with Hecker's conversion. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., in the *American Historical Review,* expressed the hope that Father Holden would write another volume dealing with Hecker's later career. The finished work will comprise a full account of Hecker's entire life. Father Holden received his doctorate in American history from the Catholic University of America in 1939. Personal letters or other Hecker material would be welcomed by Father Holden at the above address.

J. Herman Schauinger, associate professor of history, College of St. Thomas of St. Paul, Minnesota, has received a grant from the American

Philosophical Society of Philadelphia to aid him in the writing of his biography of Stephen T. Badin.

John K. Zeender, assistant professor of history in the University of Massachusetts, was awarded a Fulbright Fellowship for research work in Germany on the Center Party during the reign of Emperor William II.

Joseph M. Ryan, M.M., died suddenly of a heart attack on November 9 at the age of fifty-two. Since 1940 Father Ryan had been professor of church history and missiology at Maryknoll Seminary. In 1927 he took a master's degree at the Catholic University of America, where he submitted a thesis that was later published in the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* of January and April, 1928, under the title of "Travel Literature as Source Material for American Catholic History." Father Ryan spent seven years on the missions in China, 1928-1935, and had two years of further graduate work at the Gregorian University in Rome from 1937 to 1939. His place has been taken by R. Felix White, M.M., who had been teaching at the Maryknoll College in Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

The centennial of the Diocese of Brooklyn has been commemorated in an illustrated work entitled *One Hundredth Anniversary, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, 1853-1953,* which has been published as a supplement to *The Tablet,* the diocesan weekly newspaper. In its 168 pages every phase of the diocesan activity is covered with sketches of the early history of the varied activities and numerous pictures included to illustrate the chief personnel and institutions. The Diocese of Brooklyn has had a phenomenal growth in the 100 years since Bishop John Laughlin took charge of a see with 15,000 Catholics, twenty-three priests, twenty-two churches, and five schools. Today the number of Catholics is 1,392,000, who are served by 1,180 priests, 347 churches, and 278 schools. In the span of a century there have been only three ordinaries: John Laughlin (1853-1891), Charles E. McDonnell (1892-1921), and the present Bishop of Brooklyn, Archbishop Thomas E. Molloy, who was appointed to the see in November, 1921, and who was accorded the honor of archbishop *ad personam* in April, 1951.

In *St. Anthony's, 1837-1953, First Church in Davenport, Iowa,* by John S. Smith of St. Ambrose Academy there is a far better respect shown for sources than is the case with many histories of parishes in the United States. The format is good and the narrative reads well. Father Smith's booklet runs to just under 100 pages and has seven pages of notes at the end which show that his research into the early background of Daven-

port's first Catholic Church and congregation has been well done. The story itself goes back to the famous missionary, Samuel Mazzuchelli, O.P. There are also lists of the clergy who have served the parish and the names of the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary who have conducted the parish school since 1844.

*Documents:* The Historical Fraternity: Correspondence of Historians Grigsby, Henry, and Draper. William B. Hesseltine and Larry Gara (Eds.) (*Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.).—L'acte de baptême de Jacques Cartier. R. La Roque de Roquebrune (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Sept.).—Sigüenza y Góngora's Efforts for Readmission into the Jesuit Order. E. J. Burrus, S.J. (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).—La dernière lettre de Charles Seignobos à Ferdinand Lot. (*Revue historique*, July).

# BRIEF NOTICES

BRYAN, T. CONN. *Confederate Georgia.* (Athens: University of Georgia Press. 1953. Pp. x, 299. $4.50.)

This very readable summary of the "political, military, and social aspects of life in Georgia" during the War Between the States was begun as a dissertation at Duke University. In his topical survey, Dr. Bryan, Head of the Department of Social Science at North Georgia College, presents a mature, well-balanced, and interesting composite of Confederate Georgia through extensive use of contemporary correspondence and periodicals. Of special interest to this reviewer were the chapters entitled, "Relations with the Confederacy," spot-lighting the activity of the remarkable four-term governor, Joseph E. Brown; "Disloyalty and Desertion," giving us a complete picture of the sentiment within Georgia; "Women's Wartime Activities," and "The Churches During the War." In this last chapter only passing mention is given to Catholics, and justly so, since they constituted less than one per cent of the population and had only eleven churches in Georgia by 1866. However, a paragraph is devoted earlier to Father Thomas O'Reilly of Atlanta (p. 165) for his "heroic work" in saving his own church, four Protestant churches, the city hall, and several blocks of Atlanta residences during the "Sherman Invasion." *Confederate Georgia* is an excellent panorama of the state in its critical hour. There is a well-arranged bibliography (pp. 275-290), but the reference notes are placed at the end of the text, necessitating the troublesome turning of pages for the careful reader. However, the book is well done and is recommended. (ANDREW H. SKEABECK)

BURTON, KATHERINE. *So Much, So Soon: Father Brisson, Founder of the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales.* (New York: Benziger Bros., Inc. 1953. Pp. vii, 243. $3.50.)

Father Louis Brisson, subject of Mrs. Burton's latest biography, was the founder of religious communities of men and women dedicated to the education of youth. He was a saintly priest, and also somewhat of a pioneer in the educational field. *So Much, So Soon,* not intended as a definitive biography, is a sketch of the man, his character, and his work, based upon his letters, sermons, and writings, and also upon the recollections of those who knew him. The book is readable and is never heavy or boring. However, in view of the fact that it is directed to the Catholics of the United States, most of whom are unfamiliar with the political and religious conditions existing in France and in Europe at the end of the last century, it is regrettable that so little attempt is made to portray those conditions, and to place Father Brisson and his work in the historical framework of the times. Then, again, while considerable space is given to an almost day-by-day account of certain parts of his life, several important matters are not given the full treatment they deserve. The dispute with

Bishop Cortet is inadequately presented, the author failing to examine the issues involved and the position taken by each side. More than this, the educational innovations introduced by Father Brisson are given far too little attention. These, plus an historical slip on page 93 which might be a typographical error, are the chief points of criticism. On the whole, the book can be recommended to all American Catholics who, at present, know little or nothing about this gifted priest, whose religious sons and daughters are now beginning to play an important part in the educational scheme of the Catholic Church in this country. (FRANCIS L. RYAN)

CHAN, WING-TSIT. *Religious Trends in Modern China.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1953. Pp. xiii, 327. $4.25.)

Wing-tsit Chan's *Religious Trends in Modern China* is a challenging attempt to pin some squirming chapters of recent history of China to the religious thought of the time. The material is familiar; but it is so well presented that it makes for continuously interesting and occasionally illuminating reading.

The book begins with a thorough survey of the effect of Confucian tradition, showing the extent to which the outlook of the Chinese people has been influenced by the great sage. Confucianism, more perhaps than any other, has been accused of lack of interest in religious life, of making its ideal the total negligence of the other world and of spiritual experience. Professor Chan's book gives a different story. For Chan the whole tradition of Chinese religions, either in the form of Confucianism, Taoism, or Buddhism culminates in and is to be understood in the constant pursuit of the unity of man and heaven, which is nothing but "the completion of goodness" (p. 254). "For the last fifteen hundred years, the three systems have been mutually penetrated, interrelated, and partially identified" (p. 180). Although it seems to me that the major defect of the Oriental mentality with regard to religious problems rests with the fact that it tends to see the *sameness* rather than the *difference*, the saving grace of the East may precisely lie in this very attitude of spiritual tolerance which serves a natural ground for the edifice of Christianity. The author has not pointed out very clearly what will be "the same destination" that "the three roads" lead to, but he may well agree with the reviewer in saying that as "seen in the light of strong Chinese religious tendencies its present suspension may be only a prelude to a brighter and richer movement" (pp. x-xi), and "synthesis must be made on the highest level" (p. 185). The Chinese religious life and thought can be, without a doubt, perfected by historical Christianity as the Grecian-Roman-Hebrew civilization was perfected by Christ! (PAUL K. T. SIH)

*The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa by Otto of Freising and his Continuator, Rahewin.* Translated and annotated with an Introduction by Charles Christopher Mierow with the collaboration of Richard Emery. [Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies. No. 49.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1953. Pp. xi, 366. $5.50.)

This book was a war casualty in that its publication was long delayed by the shortage of paper and other difficulties attendant upon the last world conflict. The time lost, however, was redeemed by Professor Emery who checked the translation and provided it with an extensive bibliography and fuller annotations. Of this work Professor Mierow makes due acknowledgement, also of that of Professor Bigonigiari who advised in the rendering of the parts in which Otto delved into philosophy, and of the kindly and unfailing editorial help given by Professor Evans to whom every author in the series is deeply in debt. The translation was made from Wilman's text of the *Gesta* published in 1912 in the series *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* of the *Monumenta*. Little fault may be found with the rendering, even though sentences are sometimes long and involved. The reader should be made aware of the authors' style even at the expense of the English. That this is true of the present translation appears from the difference there is between the first two books by Bishop Otto and the last two by his continuator, Rahewin. If the English of the latter is at times labored it reflects Rahewin's clumsy and inept style, adorned though it is by purple patches borrowed from the ancients, particularly Sallust and Josephus. Throughout a striving for accuracy of rendering is evident. A check against the original yielded few cases that might be questioned. Footnotes clear up difficulties except for the identification of some little known persons. In short we are happy to see the work begun by Professor Meirow in the publication of Otto of Freising's *The Two Cities* in 1921 ably completed by the publication of the bishop's *Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* in 1953, a generation later. Would that we could also see the *Jahrbücher* of the great emperor's reign done in 1908 by Simonsfeld for the years 1152-1158, carried to 1190 by as competent a scholar. Again a "war casualty"! We hopefully await the full recovery of German historical scholarship.

Excellent as the work of the editorial office of the Columbia University Press uniformly is, we do wish it had not resorted to small Roman numerals for its book and chapter designations. A little Arabic would have pleased readers who wish to check the translation against the Latin text. (FRANCIS J. TSCHAN)

FERM, VERGILIUS (Ed.). *The American Church of the Protestant Heritage.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. 481. $6.00.)

This is a collection of essays dealing with twenty-one "big" churches of Protestant heritage in the United States, written by competent students and intimate acquaintances of those churches. The generally readable accounts are concerned with the European background and American development, as well as with the characteristic features, doctrinal, liturgical, and organizational of the churches treated. Since there are twenty-one different authors, the essays are of varying historical and literary merit. There are four especially notable omissions from the list of denominations treated: the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, the Salvation Army, Christian Science, and Jehovah's Witnesses. The editor attempts to explain these omissions on the insufficient

ground that the omitted churches have been treated in another recently published volume, *Religion in the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1948). Conversely, the inclusion of the Unitarian Church is subject to question since it does not accept the divinity of Christ and consequently is not technically a division of Protestant Christianity. However, it may, perhaps, be considered rightly a church of "Protestant heritage." There are many statements unacceptable to Catholic readers. For example, Luther did not take "his Catholicism . . . with him when he was forced out" (p. 26), and it is not true that "the early church possessed no single, distinct form, . . . and that, while any one of today's churches might rightly claim to be patterned after one or another of the early churches (for there were several, not just one), so also might every other" (pp. 333-334). The Catholic Church has never taught predestination as is implied on page 151, and the claim of the Protestant Episcopal Church to be a "fellowship within the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church" (p. 93), is inadmissible. Particularly offensive is the characterization of Catholicism as the "great Roman apostasy" (p. 380) in the article on Seventh-Day Adventists by Leroy Edwin Froom, professor of the history of prophetic interpretation, Seventh-Day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C. This volume has its value as a reference work, but the value is not so great as to justify its current retail price. (JAMES H. BAILEY, II)

GRIMES, ALAN PENDLETON. *The Political Liberalism of the New York Nation, 1865-1932.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1953. Pp. ix, 133. $1.25.)

Professor Grimes has presented a stimulating study of the New York *Nation* as it reflected American liberal thinking over the span of nearly seventy years. Confining himself to political liberalism and its necessary relationship to economic thought, the author follows the course of the *Nation* as it progressed from its laissez faire concepts to a near socialist approach toward a solution of the politico-economic problems forcibly pointed up by depression. In the seven chapters of the book, by reason of a skillful use of various sources, there is a happy blending of the thought of contemporary writers and thinkers. Thus there was avoided any danger of isolating the thought of the *Nation* from the background of intellectual ferment to be evidenced at different stages of the time under consideration. One criticism that might have been made by a Catholic Church historian of this country was forestalled in the introduction where the author explained the need of "considerable selectivity." In the *Nation*'s attitude toward programs and reflections such as those of Henry George and Edward Bellamy, perhaps, some mention might have been made of the rather summary and almost flippant treatment accorded Pope Leo XIII and the encyclical *Rerum novarum*.

This paper-backed volume, the thirty-fourth of the James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, is well composed. The index, by no means elaborate, nevertheless seems sufficiently adequate for a work of this kind. We are fortunate in having this study of such an important journal. An analysis of the way in which the *Nation* met the immediate issues of the day from its

liberal viewpoint does much to promote a better understanding of those times. (FRANCIS T. HUELLER)

IGNATIUS, MOTHER M., D.M.J. *As the Stars They Shall Shine.* (New York: Vantage Press, Inc. 1952. Pp. xix, 192. $3.00.)

The struggling Church in post-Napoleonic nineteenth-century Belgium is the background for this biography of Canon Van Crombrugghe. By means of frequent quotations from unpublished manuscripts, Mother Ignatius presents the story of the founder of her community, the Daughters of Mary and Joseph. Three other religious communities were founded by this priest-educator to meet the needs of his native land in that period. To some readers the frequent use of direct discourse may prove interesting, but for the reviewer the unity of the theme is broken by the continual use of quotations.

Only thirteen of the 189 pages deal specifically with Canon Van Crombrugghe's educational theories. No doubt members of his religious communities will read with profit the didactic exhortations, but the average reader would probably be more interested in a further development of his educational theories. However, the factual account of the development of Catholic education in Belgium as outlined in *As the Stars They Shall Shine* is a contribution to the literature in the field of the history of education. (SISTER CLAIRE LYNCH)

KAMIL, MURAD. *Das Land des Negus.* (Innsbruck: Inn-Verlag. 1953. Pp. 116. Öst. S. 45.)

Professor Kamil, a well-known Semitist of Fuad University of Cairo, presents a popularly written account of modern Ethiopia, based on his lengthy residence there during the war. It is a summary of the present religious, cultural, economic, and political status of Eritrea and Ethiopia. A generous amount of space is given to the complex religious situation which is so outstanding a feature of this little-known country. This volume is of particular interest in that here an educated Oriental passes judgment on the colonial policies of European nations. Oil has been discovered even in Ethiopia, and in the description of the oil episode (pp. 91-92), America appears in a favorable role as against Great Britain. Several pages are devoted to the political implications and material obstacles behind the proposed construction of a dam at Lake Tana on the Blue Nile. The proposal would provide Egypt with a copious supply of water in the dry season and apparently contribute to the well-being of the Sudan and Ethiopia. Much preparation and political talks have gone into the project but nothing has been realized. The book is provided with excellent pictures and maps. (ROLAND E. MURPHY)

MERRICK, M. M. *Thomas Percy: Seventh Earl.* (London: Duckett. 1949. Pp. xiii, 140. 15s.)

This is a memorial to a leader of the feudal north of England, an area which "knew no prince but a Percy" and was, therefore, at odds with the

English Reformation and the establishment of the Tudor state. It is a work conceived not in critical scholarship but as an act of piety toward the steadfast Catholic, Blessed Thomas Percy, seventh Earl of Northumberland. Happily the author defines his position and even insists that he adds nothing new in vindicating his hero against the charges of treachery, weakness, and rashness. In the regrettable absence of critical studies the volume is decidedly useful for genealogy and local history. There is an occasional piece of nonsense, e.g., "Consciously or unconsciously, and probably the latter, she Mary Queen of Scots came at the very moment when English Catholics most sorely needed a rallying point."

The trap-laden court of Elizabeth and the agents of the Tudor Church and State inevitably regarded the earl as an enemy. The spacious days of Elizabeth "were not the days that would prosper a man of simple faith and honest blood." (M. A. FITZSIMONS)

MESSENGER, RUTH ELLIS. *The Medieval Latin Hymn.* (Washington, D. C.: Capital Press. 1953. Pp. x, 138. $3.25.)

In this book Miss Messenger gives us, in eighty-two pages of text and lists of hymns, a review of the origin, development, survival, and influence of the Latin hymn and sequence, utilizing and presenting in synthesis the over twenty-five years of study she has devoted to the subject, many phases of which she has studied in much greater detail in articles in various journals. The word "review," used by Miss Messenger herself, suggests both the merits and the weaknesses of the present study. It is useful as a beginning for one who would like to know something about Latin hymnody and would go on for himself in the works to which the author refers, but it is too sketchy in itself and would not, I think, satisfy a beginner. It covers the whole span of the Christian era, from St. Hilary of Poitiers down to the influence of the hymns in our own time, and presents, in the Latin and in English translation or paraphrase, seventeen illustrative hymns. Miss Messenger treats briefly individual writers, hymns, and sequences; the hymnals; the ninth-century revival of hymns, and the origins of the sequence; their flowering in the later Middle Ages; the origin and development of processional hymns. There are ten pages of notes, principally bibliographical; an extensive bibliography; an index of Latin hymns, and a general index. This reviewer regrets that Miss Messenger did not give us the more satisfactory study of which she is capable. (JOSEPH N. GARVIN)

MOSSE, GEORGE L. *The Reformation* [Berkshire Studies in European History]. (New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1953. Pp. viii, 101. $1.40, paper; $1.85, cloth.)

The latest addition to the Berkshire Studies in European History, like its predecessors, "is designed as a week's reading" for college students. Compression, therefore, is a major desideratum and this is achieved by totally omitting

notes and by giving "an interpretive discussion" suited to the "more mature point of view (?) of college students" (p. v). On a period of human stress and travail such as the "Reformation," so-called, writing along the lines proposed is hazardous in the extreme, especially if one keeps in mind those for whom it is destined. What are we to think, e.g., of the "sale" of indulgences (p. 6) or "the shameless way in which the citizens of Wittenberg ran to buy Tetzel's indulgences, and then demanded that on their presentation they be absolved from sin" (p. 15)? This is certainly "reading . . . that is neither too specialized and technical nor too elementary" (p. v), but it is emphatically *not* "adequate." Facile synopsis is not any easier in the whole complicated controversy of "works" as opposed to "faith," and this reviewer ventures the doubt that college students in the twentieth century will grasp what it is all about. Although the "political necessity of the execution of Mary Queen of Scots" (p. 84) is not manifest, the rest of the chapter on "The English Reformation" develops the topic sentence, quoted with approval from F. M. Powicke, "The one definite thing that can be said about the Reformation in England is that it was an act of state." Even so, the number of basic points that have to be summarily treated makes the value of such a book questionable. The presentation of basic sources, judiciously selected and, perhaps, paraphrased in modern idiom, would seem to be a more worthwhile enterprise. For one thing it might help to develop the historical sense in college students. (JOSEPH M.-F. MARIQUE)

ORE, OYSTEIN. *Cardano: the Gambling Scholar, with a translation of Cardano's Book on Games of Chance.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1953. Pp. xiv, 249. $4.00.)

Only on very rare occasions does one find a publication by a distinguished mathematician with the wide reader appeal of this volume. The book proper contains five chapters, of which the first four constitute a biography of Cardano with some fascinating details on university life in the sixteenth century. Chapter V is an exposition and evaluation by a trained mathematician of Cardano's *The Book on Games of Chance.* Here the author has made a real contribution to the history of probability. At least two or three earlier attempts were made to fathom the findings of Cardano but the researchers were defeated by his "execrable composition" and "moral reflexions." Up to the present mathematical historians have credited Pascal with laying the foundation of probability theory. As a result of Professor Ore's research on the subject this honor may rest on Cardano's shoulders—at least for a while.

The ever-increasing number of theory of equations students will enjoy the author's presentation of the Cardano-Tartaglia feud over the solution of the cubic. He contends that by current standards Tartaglia was given due credit. The heat producing ingredient may well have been Cardano's publication of the formula, thus depriving Tartaglia of a "secret weapon" he had used so effectively and profitably in scholarly controversy. The last sixty pages contain a translation by Sydney Henry Gould (with notes by Professor Ore) of Car-

dano's book. They can be read with profit by mathematicians and gamblers for the author was a genius in both fields. (EDWARD J. FINAN)

RICHARDSON, CYRIL C. (Ed.). *Early Christian Fathers.* [Library of Christian Classics, Volume I.] (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1953. Pp. 415. $5.00.)

This is the first volume of the Library of Christian Classics, a project "designed to present in the English language, and in twenty-six volumes of convenient size, a selection of the most indispensable Christian treatises written prior to the end of the sixteenth century." The series appears under the general editorship of President Henry P. Van Dusen and Professor John T. McNeill of Union Theological Seminary, and John Baillie of New College, Edinburgh. It is being published concurrently in England by the Student Christian Movement Press.

Volume I, *Early Christian Fathers,* purports to give "new translations of some of the basic Christian writings of the first two centuries," "adequate introductory material," and "such notes as are necessary for understanding the text." The basic writings included are letters of Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna; the martyrdom of Polycarp; the *Didache;* Clement's "Second Letter"; the *Ad Diognetum;* Justin's First Apology; selections from Athenagoras and Irenaeus. The editor is Cyril C. Richardson, of the Union Theological Seminary, in collaboration with Eugene R. Fairweather, Edward Roche Hardy, and Massey Hamilton Shepherd.

One wonders why this volume was published. With the exception of excerpts from Justin, Athenagoras, and Irenaeus, the writings it contains are already available, freshly-translated in the Ancient Christian Writers and/or the Fathers of the Church. That the editors of the present volume have depended directly on these series, even to the "same turn of phrase" in translation, there can be no doubt. The student will be disappointed, accordingly, that the editors have not availed themselves as well of the vastly superior scholarship contained in these series. (JOHN GAVIN NOLAN)

THORNTON, FRANCIS BEAUCHESNE. *The Burning Flame. The Life of Pope Pius X.* (New York: Benziger Bros., Inc. 1953. Pp. 216. $3.00.)

Here is the story of a heart aflame for souls, the story of a priest whose burning love of the eucharistic King led him on "to restore all things to Christ" and "to be all things to all men." This story shows that God was pleased with the life of a peasant boy born in 1835 in a small town on the Lombard plains, the eldest of eight surviving children of a cobbler who, to support his family, was also the parochial janitor and village postmaster. Devoted to God and determined to help others, Joseph Sarto answered the divine call and went to the seminary on a scholarship. After ordination he spent eighteen years as a country curate and parish priest, then twenty-eight years

as an official of the diocesan curia, bishop, and cardinal and finally eleven years as supreme pontiff.

Through all the changes in his ever-enlarging career, the character and personality of Joseph Sarto was consistent. The author shows that the future pope was always a man of unaffected dignity, transparent honesty, deep prayerfulness, resolute self-denial, unlimited devotion to others, boundless energy, steadfastness, gentleness, candor, and compassion. Father Thornton not only gives the facts and events of this saintly life in reverent colors, but also relates many anecdotes that will give greater cause for veneration and admiration of Blessed Pius X. During his eleven-year pontificate he renewed the condemnation of Freemasonry, instituted a new codification of canon law, activated the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, removed grand opera from the choir loft, and removed, if it may be reverently said, the Holy Eucharist from the rationed list and made the reception of Holy Communion available to all Catholics whose right consciences determine them as worthy to receive.

In this life of Pius X, the author reveals the sources of the pontiff's heroic virtues. His devotions were ever centered around the Eucharist, the Sacred Heart, the Mother of God, St. Joseph, and the Curé of Ars. These devotions he recommended to all priests. In this latest biography, Father Thornton explains how well the saintly pope prepared the Church for the era that was being born. (JOHN J. DUGGAN)

WATTERS, MARY. *Illinois in the Second World War.* Volumes I-II. (Springfield: Illinois State Historical Library. 1951, 1952. Pp. xiii, 441; ix, 591. $5.00 for both volumes.)

When a nation goes to war today it must be able to count on the co-operation of every individual if victory is to be assured. The men on the production line, the women canning food at home, the farmers plowing their fields—all are needed to back up the men in the lines. War today is truly total war. This is the theme that Mary Watters develops in her two volumes, one of which is edited by Jay Monaghan and the second by Harry E. Pratt.

The people of Illinois realized this from the outset of the war and all cooperated in doing their share to bring victory. In an interesting manner the author tells how the state mobilized its civilian defenses, how hundreds of private individuals sacrificed their time without pay to prepare our own cities for possible attacks, to ration vital food and fuel so that all should have a fair share, to hold down prices and rents so that war should not bring more suffering than necessary to the people of the state. She tells how the state reorientated its educational system to prepare men to fight in battle, how soldiers took over the schools, and women filled teaching jobs left vacant by the drafting of men. Here, too, is the story of how the manufacturers of Illinois adapted their factories to produce war materials, how many factories supplied guns, ammunition, and raw steel by working long hours and triple shifts. Army-Navy "E"s flew proudly over many factories in Illinois. The Illinois farmers increased their agricultural output to feed the armies both here and abroad even though the draft left fewer men to cultivate the large acres of rich land.

These volumes are informative and factual in an interesting and inspiring way, for the author tells many simple stories of the men of Illinois in service, recounts their personal complaints and joys in this new life, takes us into battle with some of them, and shows them living and dying for their homes.

The volumes are lengthy and, perhaps, a little dryly written in a few sections, but the reader who pursues them to the end will set them down with a feeling of pride in his country and in Illinois. (RAYMOND J. WAHL)

YANITELLI, VICTOR R., S.J. (Ed.). *A Newman Symposium. Report of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Renascence Society at the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass., April 1952.* (Chicago: Thomas More Association. 1953. Pp. vi, 169.)

This symposium, composed of eighteen papers presented at the 1952 convention of the Catholic Renascence Society, commemorates the centenary of the publication of Newman's *Idea of a University*. The papers are arranged in three groups. Appropriately the first series deals with "The Idea of a University"; the second is entitled "Newman: the Inner Man"; and the third, "Newman: the Man of Letters."

In all symposia one looks for inequalities, and one is not surprised to find them here. Some of these papers, however, are so brief and sketchy that they seem to have been mere starting points for discussion. Only four and one-half pages are given to "Newman and the Early Church Fathers"; only two and one-half to "Newman's Literary Position." Others give the impression that they were hastily put together for the occasion with no expectation that they would be made part of a permanent record. There are, indeed, notable exceptions, such as Dr. Benard's contribution entitled "The Background and Theory of the Idea"; Francis M. Roger's "Newman's Idea and the Secular University in the United States"; Martin Svaglic's "Newman in Our Times"; and Alan I. Ryan's comparison between Newman and T. S. Eliot. Since, however, there is no bond of influence between Newman and Eliot and since the two have so little in common, one wonders why it was thought important to have this topic discussed at the convention and included in the symposium.

Lovers of Newman will find more of interest in the two papers contributed by A. Dwight Culler and David Bulman, C.P., which are entitled respectively "Remembrance of Things Past" and "Newman and Dominic Barberi." In the former Mr. Culler, an assistant professor of English at Yale, gives us his impressions of Newman's personality drawn from a year's work in the very rooms of the Birmingham Oratory which Newman inhabited, among the very books he used, the voluminous correspondence and other literary remains and non-literary mementos he left behind. In the latter Father Bulman throws light on the reason and manner in which Father Dominic Barberi was drawn into the story of Newman's conversion. One can only wish that Father Bulman had told us more about his humble and interesting fellow Passionist. (✠ LAWRENCE J. SHEHAN)

# PERIODICAL LITERATURE

## MISCELLANEOUS

The "Basic" Use of Microfilm. Allardyce Nicoll (*PMLA*, Sept., Part 2).

Shifting Currents in Historical Criticism. Beatrice Reynolds (*Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas*, Oct.).

The Professional Historian: His Theory and His Practice. Howard K. Beale (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).

Education and the Study of Christian Culture. Christopher Dawson (*Studies*, Autumn, 1953).

Education and the Classics. A. E. Raubitschek (*Folia*, Vol. VII, No. 2, 1953).

History and the Liberal Arts College. Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C. (*Catholic Educ. Rev.*, Sept.).

The Catholic College and University Library: A Second Survey. Eugene P. Willging (*ibid.*, Nov.).

Colleges in Ferment. George Paul Schmidt (*American Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Thomas von Aquin und Karl Marx oder Katholizismus und Kommunismus. Josef Lenz (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*, Heft 4, 1953).

Leo XIII on Church and State: The General Structure of the Controversy. John Courtney Murray, S.J. (*Theol. Studies*, Mar.).

Los arios o indoeuropeos primitivos y sus enigmas. Pablo Martínez del Rio (*Universidad, organo de la Universidad de Nuevo Leon*, July).

The Tower of Babel. Godfrey F. Baur, O.F.M., and Alexander Manville, O.F.M. (*Priestly Studies*, Feb., 1953).

Israel and Moab in the Ninth Century B.C. Roland E. Murphy (*Catholic Biblical Quart.*, Oct.).

Les trois premiers voyages de Saint Paul à Jérusalem. Stanislas Giet (*Recherches de science religieuse*, July).

Sénèque et le Stoïcisme dans le Traité de l'ordre de la vie et des moeurs de Julian Hayneuve, S.J. (1639). Julien-Aymard d'Angers (*ibid.*).

Les témoins de la révélation d'après Saint Irénée. Henri Holstein (*ibid.*).

Bulletins critiques: Religions de l'Asie occidentale ancienne. René Follet (*ibid.*).

Les indulgences dans la théologie de Jean Wiclif et de Jean Huss. Paul de Vooght (*ibid.*, Oct.).

Bulletins Critiques: Histoire des origines chrétiennes.—I. Histoire et hagiographie.—II. Eglise, Sacraments, Ecritures.—III. Anthropologie et spiritualité. Jean Danielou. Histoire des idées médiévals.—I. Autour d'Avicenne.—II. Le XII$^{e}$ siècle.—III. Le XIII$^{e}$ siècle.—IV. Le XIV$^{e}$ siècle. Gervais Dumeige (*ibid.*).

La question du transfert des reliques de saint Pierre "ad Catacumbas." E. Griffe (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, July).

Que représente la grande fresque de la maison chrétienne de Doura? †Jeanne Villette (*Revue Biblique*, July).

La date du martyre de S. Polycarpe. Henri-Irénée Marrou (*Analecta Bollandiana*, Fasc. I et II, 1953).

La texte complet de la vie de Christian de l'Aumône. Jean Leclercq, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Le culte ancien, à Notre-Dame de Bruges, du Martyr S. Illehère, compagnon de S. Boniface en Frise. Maurice Coens (*ibid.*).

Inscriptions grecques relatives à l'hagiographie. IX. L'Asie Mineure. François Halkin (*ibid.*).

Les sources latines d'un miracle de Gautier de Coincy: I. Apparitions de Ste Léocadie et de la Vierge à S. Ildephonse. II. Corps saints vénérés à Saint-Médard de Soissons. Appendice. A propos de reliques conservées à Saint-Médard de Soissons. Baudouin de Gaiffier (*ibid.*).

Le dossier hagiographique de S. Jacques l'Intercis. I: La passion grecque inédite. Paul Devos (*ibid.*).

Les manuscrits coptes du Vatican. Jean Doresse (*ibid.*).

Justin Martyr's Two Apologies. Arnold Ehrhardt (*Jrn. of Eccles. Hist.*, Jan., 1953).

The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa. W. H. C. Frend (*ibid.*).

Some Thirteenth-Century Sermons and Their Authors. Jennifer Sweet (*ibid.*).

Camera Papae: Problems of Papal Finance in the Later Middle Ages. Peter D. Partner (*ibid.*).

Recent French Studies in Early Church History. Marcel Simon (*ibid.*).

St. John Chrysostom's Parentage and Education. A. H. M. Jones (*Harvard Theol. Rev.*, July).

Sulla cronologia di Commodiano. M. Simonetti (*Aevum*, May).

Dámaso y Ursino. José Vives (*Hispania sacra*, July, 1952).

Augustine's Earliest Writings. David E. Roberts (*Jrn. of Religion*, July).

Metaphysics, History, and Civilization: Collingwood's Account of Their Interrelationships. Julian N. Hartt (*ibid.*)

Per il XV centenario del concilio di Calcedonia (451-1951). G. Crosignani, C.M. (*Divus Thomas*, Jan., 1953).

Uno storico centenario: S. Bernardo di Chiaravalle (1153-1953). T. Piatti, O.M.V. (*ibid.*, July).

Le ravitaillement de Rome en viande au V^e^ siècle. André Chastagnol (*Revue historique*, July).

La civilisation byzantine à propos d'un livre récent [Bréhier]. Paul Lemerle (*ibid.*).

Bulletin historique: Histoire romaine (1941-1950). André Piganiol (*ibid.*).

Roma e Constantinopla na antiguidada cristã. Frederico Laufer, S.J. (*Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, Sept.).

Byzantium-Constantinople-Istanbul. William Keane, S.J. (*Australasian Cath. Rec.*, July).

Profil de Saint Martin [of Tours]. Pierre Ménard, O.S.B. (*La revue de l'Université Laval*, Sept. and Oct.).

De permixtione sanctoralis ac temporalis in sacramentario Gregoriano Patavino. H. Schmidt (*Ephemerides Liturgicae*, Fasc. 2, 1953).

Peut-on dater le sacramentaire Grégorien? A. Chavasse (*ibid.*).

Boniface: Founder of Spiritual Unity in the West. K. Dietrich Schmidt (*Church Quart. Rev.*, July).

Damascenus Latinus: On Item 417 of Stegmueller's Repertorium Commentariorum. Eligius M. Buytaert, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies*, June-Sept., 1953).

Nouvelles précisions chronologiques sur quelques oeuvres théologiques du XII^e^ siècle. Damien Van den Eynde, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Some *Fontes* of the Commentary of Hugh de Saint Cher: William of Auxerre, Guy d'Orchelles, Alexander of Hales. Kilian F. Lynch, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Duns Scotus on the Will. J. R. Cresswell (*ibid.*).

Jonah and Zachariah on the Sistine Ceiling. Harry B. Gutman (*ibid.*).

Antonius de Bitonto, O.F.M., praedicator et scriptor saec. XV. Caelestinus Piana, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Commentary: Recent Works on Saint Francis. Ignatius Brady, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

El voto expreso de castidad de las órdenes sagradas en la alta Edad Media. Narciso Jubany (*Analecta sacra Tarraconensia*, Jan., 1952).

Ignaciana. Luis Batlle Prats (*ibid.*).

Lyrique orientale et occidentale du haut moyen âge. A. Machabey (*Romania*, T. LXXIV, No. 2, 1953).

Democracy in the Communities of the Early Middle Ages. Irving Agus (*Jewish Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 1952).

Saint Bernard devant la guerre et la paix. P. Lorson, S.J. (*Nouvelle revue théologique*, Sept.).

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. Bruno S. James (*Clergy Rev.*, Aug.).

The Crisis of Liberalism. Humphrey J. T. Johnson (*ibid.*).

Der Heilige der Krezzüge. Friedrich Heer (*Stimmen der Zeit*, Aug.).

Weltbuddhismus. Zum zweiten buddhistischen Weltkongress in Tokio. Heinrich Dumoulin, S.J. (*ibid.*, Oct.).

Sermon pour l'Assomption restitué à saint Bernard. J. Leclercq, O.S.B. (*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, Jan., 1953).

Les vertus morales acquises sont-elles de vraies vertus? La réponse des théologiens de Pierre Abélard à S. Thomas d'Aquin. O. Lottin, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Le "précepte" de la prudence chez S. Thomas d'Aquin. Th. Deman, O.P. (*ibid.*).

A Commentary on the Hexaemeron by Henry of Ghent. B. Smalley (*ibid.*).

*L'Ordinatio* de Jean Duns Scot sur le livre III des Sentences. O. Lottin, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Sur la date de quelques sermons français de Gerson. L. Mourin (*ibid.*).

Les Quodlibets de Gervais du Mont-Saint-Eloi. P. Glorieux (*ibid.*).

Note sur les questions disputées attribuées à Jean de Murro. P. Glorieux (*ibid.*).

Un texte inédit sur le désir naturel de voir Dieu: Gérard de Bologne, *Summa* XII, i, ad 3. P. de Vooght, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Heinrichs von Harclay Polemik gegen die Berechnung der zweiten Ankunft Christi. B. Hirsch-Reich (*ibid.*).

Die "Studien über Jean de Roquetaillade" von Jeanne Bignami-Odier. B. Hirsch-Reich (*ibid.*).

Autour du catalogue de la bibliothèque de Clairvaux en 1472. A. Vernet (*Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes,* Vol. CX, 1952).

Libros y bibliotecas en los estatutos de la Universidad medieval. Sara I. de Mundo (*Universidad de Antioquia,* July).

The Historical Prester John. Charles E. Nowell (*Speculum,* July).

Marriage in Avignon in the Second Half of the Fifteenth Century. René Girard (*ibid.*).

Historical Novels (1951). B. J. Whiting (*ibid.*).

Etude de quelques problèmes agraires et sociaux d'une seigneurie croisée au XIII[e] siècle. J. Prawer (*Byzantion,* Tome XXII, 1952).

Autour des Bogomiles. A. Soloviev (*ibid.*).

L'archéologie paléochrétienne en Italie. Milan et Castelseprio, "Orient ou Rome." P. Lemerle (*ibid.*).

Ecclesiastical Relations between the Despotate of Epirus and the Kingdom of Nicaea in the Years 1215 to 1230. D. M. Nicol (*ibid.*).

La Vie de S. Spyridon et Syméon Métaphraste. P. Van den Ven (*ibid.*).

A Story of Iconoclastic Times. G. Bonner (*ibid.*).

La date de la conversion des serves. G. Sp. Radojičić (*ibid.*).

A idéia da soberania do povo na literatura do fim da Idade Média. Nicolau Boer (*Revista de história,* Apr. 1953).

The Church in a Changing World: A Contribution to the Interpretation of the Renaissance. Wallace K. Ferguson (*American Histor. Rev.,* Oct.).

Panacea or Precious Bane. Tobacco in Sixteenth Century Literature. Sarah A. Dickson (*Bull. of the New York Public Library,* Sept.).

I primi monasteri di Carmelitane e le prime compagnie di Terziari Carmelitani in Firenze. Paolo Caioli, O.Carm. (*Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum,* Vol. XVIII, Fasc. I-II, 1953).

Les débuts "jansénistes" du P. Henri de S. Ignace d'après sa correspondance. Lucien Ceyssens, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Constitutiones capituli Burdigalensis anni 1294. Ludovicus Saggi, O.Carm. (*ibid.*).

The Immaculate Conception Chaplet and the Apostle of Mary (Bonaventure of Ferrara, 1806-1884). Carmel Flora, O.F.M.Cap. (*Round Table of Franciscan Research,* July).

Brother Raynerius, the Holy Infant's Friend (1511-1589). Earl Goeden, O.F.M.Cap. (*ibid.*).

Antenna crucis IV. Das Kreuz als Mastbaum und Antenne. Hugo Rahner, S.J. (*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie,* Heft 2, 1953).

Der Kirchenbergriff in den Flugschriften des Josefinischen Jahrzehnts. J. Felderer (*ibid.,* Heft 3).

Las cátedras de derecho canónico, historia eclesiástica y liturgia en el antiguo Colegio Romano. G. Villoslada, S.J. (*Gregorianum,* Vol. XXXIV, 4, 1953).

Origen y desarrollo de la historiografía misional. R. G. Villoslada, S.I. (*Misiones estranjeras,* Jan., 1953).

La obra evangelizadora en sus relaciones con las religiones de los países de misión. P. Mondreganes, O.F.M.C. (*ibid.*).

Sur la contribution des missionaires à la connaissance de l'Islam. Joseph Henninger, S.V.D. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft-Nouvelle Revue de science missionnaire,* Heft 3, 1953).

Gotō Juan, Ein Beitrag zur Missionsgeschichte Nord-Japans. Hubert Cieslik, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Martyre du bienheureux J. G. Perboyre, 1840. Fern. Combaluzier, C.M. (*ibid.*).

Nazionalismo, islamismo e laicismo in Egitto. G. de Vries, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica,* July 18).

Un eroe della chiesa martire del Giappone: Giusto Takayama Ukon. G. Laures, S.I. (*ibid.,* Aug. 15).

Il papa Paolo IV e la fondazione del Collegio Romano. P. de Leturia, S.I. (*ibid., Oct.* 3).

L'opera di Ernesto Buonaiuti. D. Grasso, S.I. (*ibid.,* Oct. 17).

La guerre des nerfs dans les prisons communistes. J. de Leffe (*Etudes,* Sept.).

EUROPEAN

Spanish Patristic Literature: A Continuation of the Aesthetics of the Classics. José Madoz, S.J. (*Folia,* Vol. VII, No. 2, 1953).

La Couronne d'Aragon et les Hafsides au XIII[e] siècle (1229-1301). Charles E. Dufourcq (*Analecta sacra Tarraconensia,* Jan., 1952).

El monasterio de Santa María de Valldaura del Vallés (1150-1179). José M. a Madurell Marimón (*ibid.*).

Por qué se retardó la fundación de la Universidad de Barcelona. Ramón Gaya Massot (*ibid.*).

San José y la ciudad de Valencia. José Ruis Serra (*ibid.*).

Fray Guillermo de Ferrera, abad del monasterio de Santes Creus. J. Ernesto Martínez Ferrando (*Hispania sacra,* July, 1952).

La biblioteca del obispo Juan Bernal Díaz de Luco. Tomás Marín (*ibid.*).

Semblanza del cardenal Pedro de Inguanzo, arzobispo en Toledo. Melchor de Pobladura, O.F.M.Cap. (*ibid.*).

Un antiphonaire mozarabe de Silos d'après les fragments du British Museum. Louis Brou (*ibid.*).

Source hagiopolite d'une antienne hispanique pour le dimanche des Rameaux. Michel Huglo (*ibid.*).

Fragmentos visigóticos de Valvanera. Ildefonso M. Gómez, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Remarques sur quelques manuscrits en écriture "visigothique." G. Fink (*ibid.*).

Goya, pintura y contrarreforma. Abel Naranjo Villegas (*Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana,* May).

La concepción de Eduardo de Hinojosa sobre la historia de las ideas jurídicas en el derecho español y su proyección en el derecho indiano. Otros trabajos leidos en el Instituto de Historia del Derecho. Richardo Levene (*Revista del Instituto de Historia del Derecho,* No. 4, 1952).

Portugal Makes History. Richard Hilton (*Dublin Rev.,* 3rd Quart., 1953).

Dutch Catholicism in Perspective. T. L. Westow (*ibid.*).

The Cave Pictures of France, Spain and Italy. Columba Cary-Elwes (*ibid.*).

Mistica e racionalismo em Portugal no século XVIII. L. Cabral de Moncada (*Boletim da Faculdade de Direito*, Vol. XXVIII, 1953).

Sguardo sulla Spagna e il suo cattolicismo a mezzo il nostro secolo. J. L. Micó Buchón, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica*, July 18).

I sindacati sovietici contro i lavoratori. U. A. Floridi, S.I. (*ibid.*, Aug. 1).

Persecuzione religiosa in Polonia. F. Cavalli, S.I. (*ibid.*, Sept. 5).

Paolo I di Russia gran maestro dell'Ordine di Malta. (Dalla corrispondenza del nunzio apostolico L. Litta). G. Castellani, S.I. (*ibid.*).

L'U.R.S.S. oggi e domani. U. A. Floridi, S.I. (*ibid.*, Sept. 19).

Cavour e le annessioni nelle lettere di Abraham Tourte. Giovanni Ferretti (*Rassegna storica del risorgimento*, Apr., 1953).

Il cardinal Lambruschini e alcune fasi della sua attività diplomatica. Enzo Piscitelli (*ibid.*)

Il problema veneto dopo Villafranca. Roberto Cessi (*ibid.*).

L'archivo dell'ambasciata di Spagna presso la Santa Sede. Alberto M. Ghisalberti (*ibid.*).

Church and State in Fascist Italy (II. Rise of Fascism). Karl Holtsnider, O.F.M. (*Priestly Studies*, Feb. 1953).

Le plus ancien cartulaire de Saint-Mont (Gers) (XI^e-XIII^e siècles). Charles Samaran (*Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, Vol. CX, 1952).

L'acte de fondation de l'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune. Jean-Marie Theurillat (*ibid.*).

Les livres de Richard de Bazoques. Jeanne Bignami-Odier et A. Vernet (*ibid.*).

Froissart historien. Le siège et la prise de la Roche-Vendeix. André Artonne (*ibid.*).

La revolution de 1369 dans le royaume de Chypre. Jean Richard (*ibid.*).

Lorenza Casoni and Papal Policy for the Church in France 1683-1689. Adrian Morey and Anthony Landor (*Jrn. of Eccles. Hist.*, Jan., 1953).

Chateaubriand, Secretary at the Legation in Rome. J. M. Gautier (*Modern Lang. Rev.*, Oct.).

Napoleon III and the Spanish Revolution of 1868. Willard A. Smith (*Jrn. of Modern Hist.*, Sept.).

The Constitutional and Political Problems of the Second Chancellor, Leo von Caprivi. Charlotte Sempell (*ibid.*).

Colonialism inside Germany: 1886-1918. Robert Lewis Koehl (*ibid.*).

International Politics and the Military Mind: The Case of the French Republic, 1911-1914. John C. Cairns (*ibid.*).

An American View of the Decembrist Revolt. Marc Raeff (*ibid.*).

Un épisode peu connu des relations culturelles entre la France et l'Espagne à la fin du XIX^e siècle. F. Cavallera (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, July).

L'Ecole des Chartes. Robert Valois, c.s.v. (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Sept.).

Osterreich-Ungarn und der Vatican während des Pontifikats Pius' X und der Wahl Benedikts XV. Friedrich Engel-Janosi (*Mitteilungen des Oesterreichischen Staatsarchivs*, Band 5, Wien, 1952).

Das Schicksal des Figurenschmuckes an der Liebfrauenkirche in Trier. Alois Thomas (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*, Heft 3, 1953).

The Historical Thought of Ernst von Lasaulx. Friedrich Engel-Janosi (*Theol. Studies*, Sept.).

A Prelude to Hitler's Greater Germany. Robert Lewis Koehl (*American Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

Socialist Unions and Socialist Patriotism in Germany, 1914-1918. John L. Snell (*ibid.*).

Central Europe and the Middle East. Joseph de Somogyi (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs*, Apr., 1953).

Foreign Investment and Political Control in Eastern Europe. Kazimierz Grzybowski (*ibid.*).

Modern Greek Government. II. The Realities. Harold F. Alderfer (*ibid.*).

Documents: The United States Recognition of the Czechoslovak National Council of Paris (September 3, 1918). Victor S. Mamatey (*ibid.*).

Review Note: A Soviet Interpretation of the SPD, 1895-1933. Henry J. Tobias and John L. Snell (*ibid.*).

Remarks on the Austrian Resistance, 1938-1945. Friedrich Engel-Janosi (*ibid.*, July).

Some Economic Aspects of the Nationality Conflict in the Habsburg Empire. Edward Marz (*ibid.*).

The German Working Class and the Russian Revolution of 1905. Richard W. Reichard (*ibid.*).

Beneš and Stalin—Moscow, 1943 and 1945. Eduard Táborský (*ibid.*).

The Golgotha of the Orthodox Church in Yugoslavia, 1941-1951. Vladimir Rodzianko (*Eastern Churches Quart.*, Summer, 1953).

The Russian Center at Fordham. Donald Attwater (*Homiletic and Pastoral Rev.*, Sept.).

Memoirs of Franz von Papen—the Scandal of the Stupid. John B. Sheerin, C.S.P. (*ibid.*, Nov.).

Three Papal Nuncios in Russia. M. J. Rouët de Journel (*Thought*, Autumn, 1953).

French Catholicism Confronts Communism. Robert Rouquette (*ibid.*).

Behind the Iron Curtain. John Gill, S.J. (*Unitas*, Apr., 1953).

---

ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND, AUSTRALIA

English Literature, 1660-1800: A Current Bibliography. Arthur Friedman, Louis A. Landa, John Loftus, and Charles B. Woods (*Philological Quart.*, July).

Victorian Bibliography for 1952. Austin Wright (*Modern Philology*, May).

The British Church and Its Remnants. Donald Attwater (*Histor. Bull.*, Nov.).

Iona and Lindisfarne. Joyce M. Winmill (*Irish Eccles. Rec.*, Aug.).

Oral-Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry. F. P. Magoun, Jr. (*Speculum*, July).

The Apostolic See and the Heads of English Religious Houses. Alfred H. Sweet (*ibid.*).

Chaucer and the Friars. Arnold Williams (*ibid.*).

The *Camera Regis* under Henry II. J. E. A. Jolliffe (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).

The Promotion of William of Wickham to the See of Winchester. J. R. L. Highfield (*Jrn. of Eccles. Hist.*, Jan., 1953).

Early Anglican Thought, 1559-1667. James Thayer Addison (*Histor. Mag. of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, Sept.).

The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution, 1642-1660. P. H. Hardacre (*Huntington Library Quart.*, Aug.).

The Rationalism of Sir Walter Scott. Duncan Forbes (*Cambridge Jrn.*, Oct.).

Friedrich von Hügel's Letters to Edmund Bishop. Nigel Abercrombie (*Dublin Rev.*, 3rd Quart. 1953).

The "Anglo-Catholic" Movement Today. Francis Edward Nugent (*Homiletic and Pastoral Rev.*, Nov.).

The Whithorn Vacancy of 1293-1294. Robert J. Bretano (*Innes Rev.*, Autumn).

The Glasgow Mission, 1792-1799. Alexander MacWilliam (*ibid.*).

The Scots College, Madrid. William McGoldrick (*ibid.*).

The Letter Sent by Iain Muideartach, Twelfth Chief of Clanranald, to Pope Urban VIII, in 1626. John Lorne Campbell (*ibid.*).

La vie latine d'un pseudo-Irlandais, S. Florentin d'Amboise. Paul Grosjean (*Analecta Bollandiana*, Tomus LXXI, Fasc. I et II, 1953).

Nationalism and the Irish Peasant, 1800-1848. Thomas N. Brown (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

AMERICAN

A Review of the Kensington Stone Research. Hjalmar Rued Holand (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.*, Summer, 1953).

New Light on the *Ark* and *Dove*. Dryden Bordley Hyde and M. V. Brewington (*Maryland Histor. Mag.*, Sept.).

Jerome and Betsy Cross the Atlantic. Dorothy M. Quynn and Frank F. White, Jr. (*ibid.*).

A Message to Fort William Henry: An Incident in the French and Indian War. Wilbur R. Jacobs (*Huntington Library Quart.*, Aug.).

The Anti-Rationalist Heritage in America: Political Realism and the Age of Reason. Norman Jacobson (*Rev. of Politics*, Oct.).

Power and Morals and the Founding Fathers: Jefferson. Adrienne Koch (*ibid.*).

Holmes, the Founding Fathers, and Our Religious Traditions. Frank Morriss (*Homiletic and Pastoral Rev.*, Oct.).

The French Huguenot Frontier Settlement of Manakin Town. James L. Bugg, Jr. (*Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, Oct.).

James Madison and the Hamilton Funding Plan. Frank B. Costello (*Histor. Bull.*, Nov.).

Catholic Political Thought in Colonial Maryland Government. Thomas O'Brien Hanley (*ibid.*).

John England, American. Andrew Murchie, O.S.B. (*St. Meinrad Essays*, Vol. 10, No. 2).

Church and State: An American Catholic Tradition. John Tracy Ellis (*Harper's Mag.*, Nov.).

The Development of the Catholic Magazine in the History of American Journalism. John B. Sheerin, C.S.P. (*Histor. Records and Studies*, Vol. XLI, 1953).

Sir Edmund Plowden and the Province of New Albion, 1632-1650. William Keller (*ibid.*).

Catholic Beginnings in the Town of New Rochelle. Frederick H. Paulmann, Jr. (*ibid.*).

The Diocese of Burlington, Vermont: 1853. William Lucey, S.J. (*Records* of the American Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila., Sept.).

Oviedo: On the Conquest of New Spain. Martin Kushinsky (*ibid.*).

The Oblates of Mary Immaculate in the Pacific Northwest, 1847-1878. George M. Waggett, O.M.I. (*ibid.*).

Home Missions and Education in the Old Northwest. Frederick I. Kuhns (*Jrn. of the Presbyterian Histor. Soc.*, Sept.).

Mission Station to Mining Town: Early Las Vegas. Glenn S. Dumke (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).

Campaign Issues and Popular Mandates in 1864. William Frank Zornow (*Mid-America*, Oct.).

Taylor's American Voyage, 1767-1769. W. H. G. Armytage (*ibid.*).

The Jesuits in Kentucky, 1831-1846. Francis X. Curran (*ibid.*).

The Benedictine Sisters and the St. Cloud Hospital. Sister Grace McDonald (*Minnesota Hist.*, Autumn, 1953).

New Subiaco Abbey, 1878-1953. Michael Lensing, O.S.B. (*Social Justice Rev.*, Sept. and Oct.).

A Trip to Quapaw in 1903. Sister M. Laurence (*Chronicles of Oklahoma*, Summer, 1953).

Cardinal Gibbons after Thirty Years. Edward A. Ryan, S.J. (*Theol. Studies*, Sept.).

Some Consequences of the Urban Movement in American History. W. Stull Holt (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Nov.).

The Decline of Political Theory. Alfred Cobban (*Pol. Science Quart.*, Sept.).

Human Nature in American Thought: The Age of Reason and Morality, 1750-1860. Merle Curti (*ibid.*).

American Foreign Policy since the War. P. S. (*Dublin Rev.*, 3rd Quart., 1953).

La théologie des "Témoins de Jéhovah." B. Lavaud (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, July).

Louis Jolliet et son dernier historien. Archange Godbout (*Culture*, Sept.).

French Capuchins in Acadia (1632-1655). Rene Wilson, O.F.M.Cap. (*Round Table of Franciscan Research*, July).

La guerre de sept ans et la civilisation canadienne. Guy Frégault (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Sept.).

Un plagiaire illustre. François Perrin du Lac. Fernand Grenier (*ibid.*).

Les canadiens veulent conserver le régime seigneurial. Marcel Joseph, s.g. (*ibid.*).

Le Père Pierre-Joseph-Marie Chaumonot, missionnaire de la Huronie. André Surprenant, s.j. (*ibid.*).

Chronique documentaire pour une nouvelle histoire coloniale. Les papiers privés. G. Debien et Autres (*ibid.*).

The Enfranchisement of Roman Catholics in the Maritimes. John Garner (*Canadian Histor. Rev.*, Sept.).

Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects (*ibid.*).

A grande capacidade náutica de Colombo. Thomaz Oscar Marcondes de Zouza (*Revista de história*, Apr.).

Spanish Interest in British Florida. Mark F. Boyd and José N. Latorre (*Florida Histor. Quart.*, Oct.).

New Mexico and the Sack of Rome: One Hundred Years Later. Eleanor B. Adams and John E. Longhurst (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, Oct.).

New Mexico during the Civil War. William I. Waldrip (*ibid.*).

Bishop Tamarón's Visitation of New Mexico, 1760. Eleanor B. Adams, (Ed.) (*ibid.*).

Iturbide. El sentido de la emancipación mejicana. Octavio Gil Munilla (*Estudios americanos*, Aug.).

La obra documental y erudita de José Toribio Medina y su contribución a la historia del derecho indiano. Ricardo Levene (*Revista del Instituto de Historia del Derecho*, No. 4, 1952).

Templo de San Juan Bautista en Acultzingo, Ver. José Gorbea Trueba (*Anales del Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia*, Tomo IV, 1949-1950).

Organización religiosa y política de tenejapa. Fernando Cámara (*ibid.*).

Los obispos de Santa Marta durante el Siglo XVI. Juan Manuel Pacheco (*Revista Javeriana*, Oct.).

El primer concilio plenario de la Iglesia filipina. Juan Antonio Eguren (*ibid.*).

Manuel González Prada: Peruvian Judge of Spain. Robert G. Mead, Jr. (*PMLA*, Sept., Part 1).

The Passing of the Coffee Plantation in the Paraíba Valley. Stanley J. Stein (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.*, Aug.).

The Struggle for Abolition in Gran Colombia. Harold C. Bierck, Jr. (*ibid.*).

A igreja brasileira de Itapira. Henrique de Morais Matos (*Revista eclesiástica brasileira*, Sept.).

O negro no Brasil e em São Paulo: aspectos numéricos. Alfredo Gomes (*Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico de São Paulo*, Vol. XLVIII, 1952).

O tráfico africano visto pelo mestre Afonso de Taunay. Alfredo Gomes (*ibid.*).

Padre Manoel da Nóbrega. J. P. Leite Cordeiro (*ibid.*, Vol. XLIX, 1953).

Antonio José Pereira. Arquimedes Pereira Guimaraes (*ibid.*).

No quarto centenario de chegada à Bahia do fundador de São Paulo. Tito Livio Ferreira (*ibid.*).

Centenario de Monsenhor Fergo O'Connor de Camargo Dauntre. Aspectos de sua vida como cidadão e sacerdote. Ricardo Gumbleton Daunt (*ibid.*).

A expedição de 1501-1502 e Amerigo Vespucci. Tomás Oscar Marcondes de Souza (*ibid.*).

# BOOKS RECEIVED

Adams, Eleanor B. *A Bio-Bibliography of Franciscan Authors in Colonial Central America.* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History. 1953. Pp. xxi, 97. $3.00.)

Allen, W. E. D. and Paul Muratoff. *Caucasian Battlefields. A History of the Wars on the Turco-Caucasian Border, 1828-1921.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1953. Pp. xxii, 614. $14.00.)

Beard, Mary R. *The Force of Women in Japanese History.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press. 1953. Pp. 196. $3.75.)

Bengtson, Herman, and Vladimir Milojcic. *Grosser historischer Weltatlas herausgegeben vom Bayerischen Schulbuch-Verlag. Erläuterungen.* 2 Vols. (München: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag. 1953. Cols. 11, 124; viii, 48, 15 Reg. 4.80 DM; 6.50 D.M.)

Beron, Richard, O.S.B. *With the Bible through the Church Year. Around the Year from Genesis to Apocalypse with Psalms and Texts on the Liturgy.* (New York: Pantheon Books. 1953. Pp. 243. $4.95.)

Bigongiari, Dino (Ed.). *The Political Ideas of St. Thomas Aquinas.* (New York: Hafner Publishing Co. 1953. Pp. xxxviii, 217. Paper cover $1.25; cloth $2.50.) Dino Bigongiari, the Da Ponte Professor of Italian in Columbia University, has made the selection of these excerpts from the political writings of St. Thomas and edited them with an introduction.

Binsfeld, Edmund L., C.PP.S. *The Society of the Precious Blood.* (Carthagena, Ohio: St. Charles Seminary. 1953. Pp. 12.)

Bloch, Marc. *The Historian's Craft.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1953. Pp. xxi, 197. $3.00.)

Brillant, Maurice et René Aigrain (Eds.). *Histoire des religions.* Vol. I. (Paris: Bloud et Gay. 1953. Pp. 308. 960 fr.)

Browning, Andrew (Ed.). *English Historical Documents.* Vol. VIII. *1660-1714.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1953. Pp. xxxii, 966. $17.50.)

Burleigh, J. H. S. (Ed.). *Augustine: Earlier Writings.* Vol. VI of the Library of Christian Classics. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1953. Pp. 413. $5.00.)

Burlingame, Roger. *Machines That Built America.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1953. Pp. 214. $3.50.)

Careless, J. M. S. *Canada. A Story of Challenge.* (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1953. Pp. xv, 417. $3.50.) The author of this volume is assistant professor of history in the University of Toronto.

Copleston, Frederick, S.J. *A History of Philosophy.* Vol. III. *Ockham to Suarez.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1953. Pp. ix, 479. $5.00.)

Cowdrey, Mary Bartlett. *American Academy of Fine Arts and American Art-Union.* 2 Vols. (New York: New York Historical Society. 1953. Pp. xiv, 311; vi, 504. $7.50 per set.) This is an elaborate publication in which many have had a hand. Mary Bartlett Cowdrey, assistant director of the Museum of Art at Smith College, is the principal author; but the history of the American Academy (I, 3-93) has been written by Theodore Sizer, pro-

fessor of the history of art at Yale; a history of the American Art-Union (I, 95-240), by Charles E. Baker, editor of the New York Historical Society; and an analysis of the "Sale of the Art-Union Holdings" (I, 295-311), by Malcolm Stearns, Jr., of Wesleyan University, and finally a foreword by James Thomas Flexner, historian of American Art. Volume I contains the various items mentioned above plus Miss Cowdrey's "Publications of the Art-Union" (I, 241-294); Volume II consists of the Exhibition Record, 1816-1852, and a seventy-five page index.

Cross, Samuel Hazzard and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Trans. and Eds.). *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Text.* (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1953. Pp. xii, 313. $5.00.)

Cunningham, William F. *General Education and the Liberal College.* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co. 1953. Pp. xviii, 286. $4.00.) Father Cunningham is professor of education in the University of Notre Dame.

Curtayne, Alice. *The Trial of Oliver Plunkett.* (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1953. Pp. vii, 239. $3.00.)

Darby, Thomas J. *Thirteen Years in a Labor School.* (New York: Radio Replies Press. 1953. Pp. vi, 92. 50¢)

De Frees, Madeline (Sister Mary Gilbert, S.N.J.M.). *The Springs of Silence.* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1953. Pp. x, 173. $2.95.)

Fenton, William N. *The Iroquois Eagle Dance: An Offshoot of the Calumet Dance.* (Analysis of the Iroquois Eagle Dance and Songs by Gertrude Prokosch Kurath.) (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1953. Pp. vi, 324. $1.50.)

Fernessole, Pierre. *Pie X. Essai historique.* II. *Du Vatican à la gloire du Benin.* (Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1953. Pp. 539. 2 vols. in one. 1,775 fr.)

Flexner, James Thomas. *The Traitor and the Spy: Benedict Arnold and John André.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1953. Pp. x, 431, $5.75.)

Florez, Luis. *Lengua española.* (Bogotà: Instituto Caro y Cuervo. 1953. Pp. 299.)

Ford, Franklin L. *Robe and Sword. The Regrouping of the French Aristocracy after Louis XIV.* Harvard Historical Studies Vol. LXIV. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1953. Pp. xii, 280. $6.00.)

Fothergill, Philip G. *Historical Aspects of Organic Evolution.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. xvii, 427. $6.00.) The author is a lecturer in botany in King's College of the University of Durham. The foreword has been written by J. W. Heslop Harrison.

Frankl, Victor. *Espíritu y camino de Hispanoamérica.* Tomo I. *La cultura hispanoamericana y la filosofía europea.* (Bogotà: Ministerio de Educación Nacional Ediciones de la Revista Bolívar. 1953. Pp. 580.) Dr. Frankl is a member of the faculties of both the National University of Colombia and the Javeriana in Bogotà.

Fridrichsen, Anton and other members of Uppsala University. *The Root of the Vine. Essays in Biblical Theology.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. vii, 160. $4.75.) A collection of seven essays, mainly on New Testament topics, in the style of the typological exegesis represented by the Uppsala school. This volume is an interesting example of the new Scandinavian approach to the Bible, which is a return to traditional positions in many respects.

Gallagher, Louis J., S.J. (Trans. from the Latin). *China in the Sixteenth Century. The Journals of Matthew Ricci: 1583-1610.* (New York: Random House. 1953. Pp. xxii, 616. $7.50.)

Gardiner, Harold C., S.J. *Norms for the Novel.* (New York: America Press. 1953. Pp. ix, 180. $2.00.)

Gates, Paul Wallace, Helen Maud Cam and Hajo Holborn. Chester McA. Destler (Ed.). *Liberalism as a Force in History. Lectures on Aspects of the Liberal Tradition.* (New London: New London Printing Co., Inc. 1953. Pp. 52. Paper $1.25; cloth $2.00.) This volume contains the Henry Wells Lawrence Memorial Lectures at Connecticut College for 1950-1952. They were delivered by Hajo Holborn of Yale in 1950 on "The Reasons for the Failure of the Paris Peace Settlement," Paul Wallace Gates of Cornell in 1951 on "From Individualism to Collectivism in American Land Policy," and in 1952 Helen Maud Cam of Radcliffe and Harvard devoted her lecture to "Representative Institutions in England and Europe in the Fifteenth Century in Relation to Later Developments." The volume is edited by Chester McArthur Destler, Chairman of the Department of History at Connecticut College.

Gilly de Collières, Renée. *La Vierge messagère du coeur. Apparitions et messages.* (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1953. Pp. xv, 245. 330 frs.)

Graubard, Mark. *Astrology and Alchemy: Two Fossil Sciences.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. xi, 382. $5.00.)

Haas, Emma B., Anne Harris and Thomas W. Ray (Compilers). *List of Photographs Made by the Office of War Information at the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, 1945.* (Washington: National Archives. 1953. Pp. vi, 40.)

Hafford, Gabriel W. and George Kolanda. *1954 Christian Life Calendar.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1953. Pp. 60. $1.00.)

Hamilton, Raphael N., S.J. *The Story of Marquette University. An Object Lesson in the Development of Catholic Higher Education.* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press. 1953. Pp. xi, 434. $6.00.)

Ipser, Karl. *Vatican Art.* Translated by Doireann MacDermott. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. 198, 160 illustrations. $7.50.)

Jordan, Philip D. *The People's Health. A History of Public Health in Minnesota to 1948.* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society. 1953. Pp. xii, 524. $5.00.)

Langmack, Holger Christian. *God and the Universe. Unity of Science and Religion.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. 173. $4.75.)

Lewis, Clifford M., S.J. and Albert J. Loomie, S.J. *The Spanish Jesuit Mission in Virginia, 1570-1572.* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Virginia Historical Society by the University of North Carolina Press. 1953. Pp. xviii, 294. $7.50.)

Lindberg, John. *Foundations of Social Survival.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1953. Pp. viii, 260. $3.50.)

Lovasik, Lawrence G., S.V.D. *Praying the Gospels. Meditations in Prayer on the Life of Christ according to the Four Evangelists.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1953. Pp. xv, 333. $4.00.) This is essentially a meditation book on the life of Christ. The author has selected several Gospel texts in chronological order and composed the meditations in the style of affective prayer, speaking to Christ throughout in the second person.

Lukacs, John A. *The Great Powers and Eastern Europe.* (New York: American Book Co. 1953. Pp. xii, 878. $7.50.)

McNeill, William H. *History Handbook of Western Civilization.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1953. Pp. xiii, 739. $4.50.)

Marasciulo, Edward. *Survey of Research and Investigations in Progress and Contemplated in the Field of Latin American Subjects in Colleges and Universities in the United States and Canada during the School Year, 1952-1953.* (Gainesville: School of Inter-American Studies, University of Florida. 1953. Pp. 24.)

Mauriac, François. *Letters on Art and Literature.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. 120.)

Mavro, Alexander P. (Comp.). *Records of Selected Foreign Service Posts.* (Washington: National Archives. 1953. Pp. v, 51.)

Maynard, Theodore. *The Catholic Church and the American Idea.* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1953. Pp. vii, 309. $3.50.)

Menzies, Lucy (Trans.). *The Revelations of Mechthild of Magdeburg (1210-1297), or The Flowing Light of the Godhead.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc. 1953. Pp. xxxvii, 263. $5.00.) This is the first English translation of a thirteenth-century work. The only complete codex is in the library of the Abbey of Einsiedeln where the translator worked during three years.

Moody, Joseph N. (Ed.). *Church and Society. Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movements, 1789-1950.* (New York: Arts, Inc. 1953. Pp. xiv, 914. $12.00.)

Morelli, Emilia. *La politica estera di Tommaso Bernetti, segretario di stato di Gregorio XVI.* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura. 1953. Pp. 269. 2,000 lire.)

Mortimer, R. C. *Western Canon Law.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1953. Pp. 92. $2.00.)

Morton, Louis. *The Fall of the Philippines.* (Washington: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army. 1953. Pp. xvii, 626. $5.25.)

Neill, Thomas P. *The Rise and Decline of Liberalism.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1953. Pp. xi, 321. $5.50.)

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Christian Realism and Political Problems.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1953. Pp. 203. $3.00.)

Oberste, William H. *Texas Irish Empresarios and Their Colonies: Power & Hewetson, McMullen & McGloin, Refugio-San Patricio.* (Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co. 1953. Pp. xii, 310. $10.00.)

O'Donnell, George E. *St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook. Vol. II. 1843-1953.* (Philadelphia: American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. 1953. Pp. xiii, 358. $4.00.) Volume II of Father O'Donnell's history of Overbrook chronicles the happenings since the publication of Volume I in 1943, and provides in a series of appendices a large body of data concerning the trustees, faculty, and alumni of the seminary.

Oman, C. W. C. *The Art of War in the Middle Ages, A.D. 378-1515.* Revised and edited by John H. Beeler. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1953. Pp. xviii, 176. $3.00.) This volume was awarded the Lothian Essay Prize when Oman was an undergraduate at Oxford and was published in 1885.

Dr. Beeler has incorporated many facts which scholars have established about mediaeval warfare since the original publication.

*One Hundred Years of Achievement by the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Burlington, Vermont. 1853-1952.* (Burlington: Diocese of Burlington, Vermont. 1953. Pp. 223.) This richly illustrated booklet commemorates the centennial of the Diocese of Burlington.

Oursler, Fulton and April Oursler Armstrong. *The Greatest Faith Ever Known.* (New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc. 1953. Pp. 383. $3.95.)

Padmore, George. *The Gold Coast Revolution. The Struggle of an African People from Slavery to Freedom.* (New York: British Book Centre Inc.; London: Dennis Dobson Ltd. 1953. Pp. vii, 272. $3.00.)

Perros, George P. (Comp.). *Records of the Special Committee of the Senate on Atomic Energy, 1945-46* (Washington: National Archives. 1953. Pp. v, 8.)

———. *Records of the Special Committee of the Senate to Investigate Petroleum Resources.* (Washington: National Archives. 1953. Pp. v, 19.)

Pochmann, Henry A. and Arthur R. Schultz. *Bibliography of German Culture in America to 1940.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1953. Pp. xxxii, 483. $6.50.)

Powers, James M. (Ed.). *Memoirs. The Seminary of Montezuma. Documents and Writings of the Most Reverend John Mark Gannon, Chairman of the Bishops' Committee for Montezuma Seminary and His Episcopal Associates.* (Erie: 205 W. 9th Street. 1953. Pp. xiii, 225.)

Prescott, H. F. M. *Mary Tudor.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1953. Pp. xiii, 439. $5.00.)

*Problèmes humains du travail. Huitième congrès des relations industrielles de Laval.* (Quebec: Les Presses Universitaires Laval. 1953. Pp. 160. $2.75.) A series of papers read by various authors at a meeting in April, 1953, held at Laval University under the auspices of the Department of Industrial Relations of the Faculty of Social Sciences.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology.* Vol. II. *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1953. Pp. xi, 450. $5.50.)

Rector, William Gerald. *Log Transportation in the Lake States Lumber Industry, 1840-1918* (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Co. 1953. Pp. 352. $10.00.) This volume describes the movement of logs and its relationship to land settlement, waterway development, railroad construction, lumber productions and prices. The author teaches at Southern State Teachers College, Springfield, South Dakota. The volume is equipped with a classified bibliography, analytical index, a frontispiece, and five graphs.

Revello, Jose Torre. *Bibliografia de las Islas Malvinas. Obras, mapas y documentos.* (Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires. 1953. Pp. xi, 261.)

Revill, J. C. *World History.* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1953. Pp. xiv, 760. $5.25.)

Reynolds, James A. (Ed.). *Historical Records and Studies.* Vol. XLI. (New York: United States Catholic Historical Society. 1953. Pp. 102.)

Ricciotti, Giuseppe. *Paul the Apostle.* Translated by Alba Zizzamia. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1953. Pp. xi, 540. $7.50.)

Richardson, W. C. *Stephen Vaughan, Financial Agent of Henry VIII. A Study of Financial Relations with the Low Countries.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1953. Pp. xii, 106. $1.50.)

Richmond, Admiral Sir Herbert. *The Navy as an Instrument of Policy, 1558-1727.* Edited by E. A. Hughes. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1953. Pp. 404. $12.00.)

Rodick, Burleigh Cushing. *American Constitutional Custom: A Forgotten Factor in the Founding.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. xx, 244. $4.75.)

Rupert, Joanne H., S.J. *De programmate Jacobi Lainii, secundi praepositi generalis Societatis Jesu, reformationem papatui per concilium generale imponere temptantis.* (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana. 1953. Pp. 50.) Excerpts from a dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Ecclesiastical History of the Gregorian University.

*São Paulo em quatro séculos.* Vol. I. (São Paulo: Instituto Histórico e Geográfico de São Paulo. 1954. Pp. 371.) A volume of essays sponsored by the Historical and Geographical Institute of São Paulo to commemorate the fourth centennial of the city of São Paulo, Brazil.

Scott, J. F. *The Scientific Work of René Descartes (1596-1650).* (London: Taylor & Francis, Ltd. 1953. Pp. viii, 211.)

Silesius, Angelus. *The Cherubinic Wanderer.* Translated by Willard R. Trask. (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1953. Pp. 61. $2.00.)

Sizer, Theodore, (Ed.). *The Autobiography of Colonel John Trumbull, Patriot-Artist, 1756-1843.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1953. Pp. xxiii, 404. $6.00.)

Smith, John S. *St. Anthony's, 1837-1953. First Church in Davenport, Iowa.* (Davenport: St. Anthony's Rectory. 1953. Pp. 99.)

Southwell, Robert. *An Humble Supplication to Her Maiestie.* Edited by R. C. Bald. (Cambridge: At the University Press. 1953. Pp. xxii, 80. $3.00.)

Specker, Johann, S.M.B. *Die Missionsmethode in Spanisch-Amerika im 16. Jahrhundert mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Konzilien und Synoden.* (Schöneck-Beckenried, Suisse: Administration der Neuen Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft. 1953. Pp. xxi, 247. 15.60 SFR.)

Strauss, Leo. *Natural Right and History.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1953. Pp. ix, 327. $5.00.)

Thompson, Faith. *A Short History of Parliament, 1295-1642.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1953. Pp. x, 280. $4.50.)

Thomson, S. Harrison. *Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the United States and Canada.* (Boulder: University of Colorado. 1953. Pp. 142. $2.00.)

Tibesar, Antonine S., O.F.M. *Franciscan Beginnings in Colonial Peru.* (Washington: Academy of American Franciscan History. 1953. Pp. xviii, 162. $4.00.)

Timm, Helga. *Die deutsche Sozialpolitik und der Bruch der grossen Koalition im März 1930.* (Dusseldorf: Droste Verlag. 1952. Pp. 215.)

Ulriksson, Vidkunn. *The Telegraphers: Their Craft and Their Unions.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press. 1953. Pp. v, 218. $3.75.)

von Auw, Lydia. *Angelo Clareno et les spirituels franciscains.* (Lausanne: Université de Lausanne. 1953. Pp. 58.) A thesis presented to the Faculty of Theology of the University of Lausanne for the doctorate.

White, Leonard D. *The States and the Nation.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1953. Pp. xii, 103. $2.75.) Mr. White is professor of public administration in the University of Chicago. The three chapters of the book represent the Edward Douglass White Lectures on Citizenship at Louisiana State University and are entitled: "The March of Power to Washington," "Strength and Limitations of the States," and "The Next Quarter Century."

Williamson, James A. *The Tudor Age.* (New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1953. Pp. xxiii, 448. $5.00.)

*Windows on the Infinite. The Papacy and the Liberal Arts.* (Detroit: Marygrove College. 1953. Pp. viii, 66.) The thirteenth volume in the series of annual student symposia published by Marygrove College.